




THE EARLIEST PICTURE WRITING ; about 4000 B.C. An engraved stone from Kish in Sumeria



THE EARLIEST PEN. A bone instrument for writing cuneiform (wedge-shaped) signs. About 2000 B.C.



CUNEIFORM WRITING

A BRIEF HISTORY
OF
Civilization

by

JOHN S. HOYLAND

M.A. (Cantab.)



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E C. 4
London Edinburgh Glasgow New York
Toronto Melbourne Capetown Bombay
Calcutta Madras
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE
UNIVERSITY

FIRST PUBLISHED 1925
REPRINTED 1932, 1939, 1940

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY JOHN JOHNSON, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

FOREWORD

DURING the meetings, in 1921, of a Committee for the Revision of the Curriculum in Secondary Schools, the need was expressed for the inclusion in the school course of a brief history of civilization. The author of this book, who was a member of the Committee, has tried to meet the need. To Mr. Wells's *Outline of History* he owes a great deal, as every writer must who attempts to survey the life of the peoples throughout the ages. The names of some of the other books from which help has been taken will be found in the Note on Books ; especial acknowledgements are due to Professor Davis's masterly little book on *Mediaeval Europe*.

In a book of this description, dealing with movements, tendencies, and influences, the precise dates of the lives, reigns, or events referred to are of secondary importance. Such dates have been inserted in brackets in the following pages, not that they may be committed to memory, but for the convenience of the reader, that they may be readily available if required.

J. S. H.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
List of Illustrations	7
Note on Books	II
I. The Beginnings of History	15
II. The Meaning of Civilization : India and China	49
III. Christianity and Islam	71
IV. Greece	93
V. Rome	117
VI. The Middle Ages	151
VII. Nationalism	190
VIII. Internationalism	217
IX. The Return of Greece	241
Chronological Table	283

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

We owe a large debt throughout to Messrs. B. ASHMOLE, L. H. DUDLEY BUXTON, S. CASSON, R. GORBOLD, and P. HART, who have allowed us to draw freely on collections of photographs which they have themselves taken.

	PAGE
The earliest picture writing, about 4000 B. C. (engraved stone from Kish in Sumeria); the earliest pen, about 2000 B. C. (a bone instrument for writing cuneiform (wedge-shaped) signs); cuneiform writing. (By the courtesy of Professor S. Langdon)	<i>Frontispiece</i>
The Art of Primitive Man. Bushman Paintings from South Africa. (Miss Helen Tongue)	14
Some prehistoric beasts. (Adapted from a drawing by Professor E. S. Goodrich)	17
Plesiosaur's paddle. (Dorchester Museum)	18
A forest of the coal period	19
A type of early man (By the courtesy of Mr. Adolphus E. Rost).	22
Ice-age scenery—Spitzbergen. (Phot. by Dr. T. G. Longstaffe)	25
Racial types—Asiatic and American	26
Racial types—European and African	27
The tundra lands of Siberia—reindeer on a drift of snow. (Phot. by Miss Czaphicka)	29
The skin dwellings of the Mongolians	31
Mongolian tribes on the move	32
Sumeria—ruins of the palace at Kish; about 3500 B. C. (Phot. by Professor S. Langdon)	35
Ruins of Ancient Babylon (7th century B. C.)	36
A Ghufa, the oldest form of craft in the world, crossing the Tigris	36
An Egyptian scribe, 5th dynasty. (Cairo Museum)	37
Memphis—sacred lake	38
The Nile—Gebel abu Feda (Cliff of Tombs)	38
Karnak—papyrus-bud columns in Festal Temple of Thothmes III	39
Egyptian infantry on the march (12th dynasty) (Cairo Museum)	40
Semites made captive by the Egyptians (From an Egyptian relief)	40
Egyptian Sculpture—A Prince and Princess of the Old Kingdom. (Cairo Museum)	41
The sacred bull of Crete—a fountain-head from Cnossos	42
Crete—Hall of Columns and Staircase, Cnossos	43
Crete—Store-room leading out of Great Corridor, Cnossos	43
Cretan ornament	43
Phoenicia the Sea Power—entrance to the Port of Motya, an island off Sicily	44
An early Chinese bronze	46
Early writing—Sumerian; old Babylonian; old Chinese; Hittite; Minoan; Egyptian; Assyrian (Cuneiform)	47
Pottery of the Iron Age	48
From nomad life to settlement in Arabia	53
North gate of the Great Stūpa at Sānchi. (Archaeological Survey of India)	55
A Buddhist Cave-Temple—Ajanta Cave 26 excavated between A. D. 500 and 642	57
Gautama Buddha	59
A Buddhist monastery in Tibet. (Phot. by Sir Charles Bell)	60
Buddhist monks at prayer in a Tibetan monastery. (Phot. by Mr. Rosemeyer)	61

	PAGE
A Mogul Emperor and his Court	63
The Taj Mahal. (Phot. by Prof. A. A. Macdonell)	63
The Great Wall of China as it crosses the Nankow Pass with protecting towers every 200 yards. (Underwood Press Service)	65
A Buddhist priest in China saying his offices	67
Chinese architecture—a temple	69
A vanquished people (perhaps the Jews) led away captive to Assyria. (Les Archives photographiques d'Art et d'Histoire)	73
The earliest statue of Christ. (Phot. by Alinari)	77
Believed to be the earliest painting of Christ. A 2nd-century fresco from a subterranean chamber in Rome	79
Modern Arab types. The men's head-dress varies according to the tribe	81
A passage from the Koran. (Bodleian MS. Marsh 2)	83
Moslem art—a Lectern for the Koran	85
Street scene in old Bagdad. (Phot. by Mr. R. Gorbald)	87
Rhodes, St. Nicholas's Fort, once used as a lighthouse by the Knights of St. John. (Phot. by Baron Belabre)	88
Seal of a Preceptor of Knights Templars in Yorkshire—the Cross above the Crescent. Date 1303. (British Museum).	89
Alhambra, the Court of the Lions. (Phot. by P. Hart)	91
The Mosque in Constantinople, which was once the Church of Sancta Sophia (6th century)	92
Troy	94
The Olive-Groves of Greece—behind, Aegosthena, a ruined fortress of the 4th century B.C.	97
A Greek Theatre—ruins at Epidaurus said once to have seated more than 20,000 spectators	101
The Erechtheum on the Athenian Acropolis, in which were preserved the salt spring of Poseidon and the olive-tree given by Athene	101
Greek Art—a statue of the Goddess of Health, 4th century B.C. (Sir Alfred Mond's collection)	103
Coin of Darius showing the Great King passing through his dominions with bow and spear	105
The Dardanelles—the vessel is a relic of the Great War	106
Marathon	107
Thermopylae. (Hellenic Society)	107
Socrates—from a Hellenistic gem. (By the courtesy of Sir Arthur Evans)	109
Alexander the Great	113
Alexander's route to the East—the plain of the Oxus, showing British troops crossing during the Great War	113
The walls of Merv, one of Alexander's foundations in central Asia	113
An early use of steam-power by Heron of Alexandria. ? 1st century B.C.	114
Aristotle—from the head in the Hofmuseum, Vienna. (Mansell)	115
Plato—a copy of an original of the 4th century B.C., at Holkham Hall, Norfolk	115
'Steep hills . . . suitable for defence.' An Italian hill town. (Phot. by R. Gardner)	119
Vesuvius and Naples from 'Virgil's Tomb'. (Phot. by Mr. W. A. Casson)	121
The Bay of Carthage. (Phot. by Mr. W. A. Casson)	123
The Rich, the Poor (Capitoline Museum), the Villa, and the Cottage	127
The Rivals—Pompey (Copenhagen head) and Julius Caesar (British Museum gem)	129
Pliny's Tuscan Villa. Reconstruction by Schinkel	130
Pompeii—the excavation of a street. In the background a modern house built on the ashes covering the ancient city. (Phot. by F. R. Ratcliff)	132
Roman Colonization—the remains of Timgad in northern Africa	133

	PAGE
Hadrian's Villa—the Great Baths	135
A vast Roman Amphitheatre at El Djem	136
Exhibitions and Contests of Wild Beasts (late Byzantine). A relief from the Balkans	137
Roman Gladiators. (British Museum)	137
Tombstone of man and wife. The husband holds the testament, the wife her ring	138
Roman Road in Syria. (Phot. by Sir Aurel Stein)	141
Map—Rome the Road-Maker	143
The Walls of Constantinople	146
Coin of Constantine—standard surmounted by the monogram of Christ	147
The Golden Horn	148
An engraving of Constantinople in 1620. (Sandys's <i>Journey</i>)	149
An Italian view of the northern invader	150
'The rich man in his castle, The poor man at his gate' (Jean Fouquet's illustration of Job in the costume of his own time, 15th century). (Phot. by Giraudon)	155
Map—The Empire of Charlemagne	159
The <i>De Cura Pastoralis</i> of Pope Gregory the Great. An 11th-century MS.	164
The Palais des Papes, Avignon	166
'Feudal cruelty.' The cage in the dungeon of Loches in which Louis XI imprisoned Cardinal La Balue. (Librairie Reymond, Loches)	167
A Medieval Town—the city walls of Avila in Spain. (Phot. by J. R. H. Weaver)	171
A street scene in the Middle Ages. The Author presents a book to his Patron, 15th century. From a miniature by Jean Fouquet. (Giraudon)	173
Longbowman and Crossbowman of the 15th Century	178
A Medieval Siege—from a Flemish MS. about 1480 made for Edward IV. Royal MS. 14 E IV	179
Parliament of Edward I. (Society of Antiquaries)	183
Interior of the House of Commons in 1742	187
The Potosí Gold Mines in Bolivia. From Zarate, <i>History of the Discovery and Conquest of Peru</i> , 1555	194
The Lure of Gold—English exploitation of gold in North America. Advertisement from Houghton's <i>Collection</i> , Nov. 1649	195
Louis XIV	196
Oliver Cromwell (Duke of Buccleuch's miniature) and Napoleon (Bodleian Library)	197
Rousseau. (The Geneva Portrait)	199
Napoleon helps himself to Europe. While Pitt holds the sea for England. Gillray's cartoon of 1805	205
Coalition— <i>Punch's</i> cartoon of the Crimean War	208
The Congress of Vienna	210
Signatures to 'the Scrap of Paper'	211
<i>Punch's</i> cartoon on the Greek frontier question, 1880	212
Arbitration. The Alaska boundary. Three's company, two's none. (<i>Punch</i> cartoon)	214
The Hope of the World— <i>Punch's</i> cartoon on the League of Nations, 1920	216
Surat, the early factory, 1638. (From Von Mandelslo's account of his travels in the East)	219
Advertisement of cargo arrived from Surat, 1693. From Houghton's <i>Collection</i>	219
Plantation-News, from <i>The Gloucester Journal</i> , Feb. 17, 1740-1, and an advertisement from Houghton's <i>Collection</i> , 1696	222
Company Promotion—a satiric playing-card of the time of the South Sea Bubble	223
Map of the States, 1775-83	224

	PAGE
Canberra—ploughing the streets of the great new Australian Capital, 1924. (Sport and General Agency)	225
<i>Punch</i> cartoons illustrating the self-government of the Dominions	226
Map of the British Empire and mandatory areas, 1924	230
The earliest engraving of Aden	231
The tradition of slavery in North America—part of a leading article in a Journal of 1694 advocating a further development of the trade.	233
<i>Punch</i> cartoon on Roosevelt and the Meat Trusts	236
Early arguments for emigration	237
Immigration—Ellis Island, outside New York, where immigrants undergo examination and quarantine. (Sport and General Agency)	239
Scientific Advertisements at the end of the 17th century. From Houghton's <i>Collection</i> , Feb. 15, 1694-5, and June 29, 1694	243
Erasmus, Calvin, and Luther. (Phot. by F. Bruckmann)	245
Callot's engraving of the beggar of his time, 1622	246
The Reformation—Preaching at St. Paul's Cross. (From an engraving after a picture in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries)	247
Columbus's fleet reaching America. From a woodcut of 1494	251
Magellan's ship <i>Victoria</i>	251
A Persian caravan. (R. Gorbald)	252
Roger Bacon and a pupil. (From a 15th-century MS. of his <i>De Retardatione Senectutis</i> , Bodleian Library)	256
Mechanical drawings by Leonardo da Vinci (From Feldhaus, <i>Leonardo der Techniker und Erfinder</i>)	257
Galileo's Telescope (Alinari)	258
An Observatory in 1587, with astronomical instruments. (From <i>Cosmographia Blaviana</i> , 1662)	259
A chemical laboratory in 1747. (<i>Universal Magazine</i> , 1747)	260
A printing office of about 1600. (From <i>Nova Reperta</i> , Antwerp, c. 1600)	261
Modern factory development—scene in the 'Black Country'	262
An ancient Roman Aqueduct in Sicily	267
Aqueduct of the Shropshire Union Canal in Wales. (Phot. Great Western Railway)	267
Charles Darwin. (Phot. by F. Bruckmann)	268
Introduction of Paine's <i>Common Sense</i>	271
The Extension of men's suffrage Doyle's cartoon in 1831	275
<i>Punch</i> 's cartoon of the Women's Suffrage movement, 13 July 1910	275
After the Reform Bill—cartoon by J. Doyle	277

NOTE ON BOOKS

THE following books will, among very many others, be found useful for further study in the subjects dealt with in the chapters named :

I

Thomson, *The Outline of Science*.
Thomson and Geddes, *Evolution*.
Gregory, *The Making of the Earth*.
Moore, *The Origin and Nature of Life*.
Goodrich, *Evolution of Living Organisms*.
Marett, *Anthropology*.
Myres, *The Dawn of History*.
Hogarth, *The Ancient East*.
Monro, *Prehistoric Britain*.
Breasted, *Ancient Times*.

II

Thompson, *History of India*.
Smith, V., *Oxford History of India* (for reference).
Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious History of India* (for reference).
Tagore, *Kabir's Poems*.
Tagore, *Gitanjali*.
Arnold, *The Light of Asia*.
Davids, *Buddhism*.
Giles, *The Civilization of China*.
Giles, *History of Chinese Literature* (for reference).

III

The Bible.
Blunt, *Israel in World History*.
Ottley, *History of the Hebrews*.
Sarson and Phillips, *History of the People of Israel*.
Stalker, *Life of Jesus Christ*.
Bate, *History of the Church to A. D. 325*.
Robinson, *The Conversion of Europe* (for reference).
The Koran.
Margoliouth, *Mohammedanism*.

IV

Bury, *History of Greece*.
Warde Fowler, *The City-State of the Greeks and Romans*.
Zimmern, *Greek Commonwealth*.
CaIRD, *Plato's Four Socratic Dialogues*.
Murray, *Ancient Greek Literature*.

Harrison, *Ancient Art and Ritual*.
 Church, *Homer*.
 Murray, *The Plays of Euripides*.
 Livingstone, *The Legacy of Greece*.
 Livingstone, *The Pageant of Greece*.
 Casson, *Ancient Greece*.
 James, *Our Hellenic Heritage*.

V

How and Leigh, *History of Rome*.
 Warde Fowler, *Rome*.
 Matheson, *Growth of Rome*.
 Mackail, *Latin Literature*.
 Wight Duff, *Writers of Rome*.
 Bailey, *The Legacy of Rome*.
 Bosworth Smith, *Carthage and the Carthaginians*.
 Bigg, *The Church's Task in the Roman Empire*.
 Dill, *Roman Society in the last century of the Western Empire*.
 Smith, *Student's Edition of Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (for reference).
 Hubbard, *The Fate of Empires*.

VI

Davis, *Mediaeval Europe*.
 Barry, *The Papacy and Modern Times*.
 Bateson, *Mediaeval England*.
 Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*.
 Bell, *A Short History of the Papacy*.
 Masterman, *The Dawn of Mediaeval Europe*.
 Lees, *The Central Period of the Middle Age*.
Mediaeval England, ed. Barnard and Davis.
 Lodge, *The End of the Middle Age*.
 Ilbert, *Parliament*.
Cambridge Mediaeval History (for reference).

VII

Hollings, *Europe in Renaissance and Reformation*.
 Johnson, *The Age of the Enlightened Despot*.
 Marriott, *The Remaking of Modern Europe*.
 Mowat, *The European States System*.
 Robinson and Beard, *The Development of Modern Europe*.
 Mowat, *A New History of Great Britain*.
 Marriott and Robertson, *The Evolution of Prussia*.
Cambridge Modern History (for reference).
 Pollard, *A Short History of the Great War*.

VIII

Williamson, *Expansion of Christendom*.
 Harris, *The Peace in the Making*.

Seeley, *The Expansion of England*.
 Kermack, *Expansion of Britain*.
 Bagehot, *The English Constitution*.
 Morris and Wood, *The English-speaking Nations*.
 Bradley, *Canada*.
 Ramsay Muir, *Growth of the British Commonwealth*.
 Channing, *Student's History of the United States*.
 Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*.
 Chesterton, *History of the United States*.
 Charnwood, *Abraham Lincoln*.
 Paxson, *The American Civil War*.

IX

Sichel, *The Renaissance*.
 Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus*.
 Lindsay, *Life of Luther*.
 Dark, *The Quest of the Indies*.
 Prescott, *The Conquest of Peru*.
 Bruce, *Polar Exploration*.
 Johnston, *The Opening-up of Africa*.
 Thomson, *Introduction to Science*.
 Belloc, *The French Revolution*.
 Fisher, *Napoleon*.
 Jenks, *History of Politics*.
 Harrison, *William the Silent*.
 Trevelyan, *Garibaldi and the Making of Italy*.
 Macgregor, *The Evolution of Industry*.

In compiling the above list the attempt has been made to confine attention to subjects actually touched on in this book, and to name so far as possible works which are cheap, short, and easily accessible.


For the whole subject the following may be recommended :

Wells, *The Outline of History*.
 Thomson, *The Outline of Science*.
 Fairgrieve, *Geography and World Power*.
 Bury, *A History of Freedom of Thought*.
 Marvin, *The Living Past*.
 Robinson, *History of Western Europe*.
 Marvin, *The Unity of Western Civilization*.
 Marvin, *Progress and History*.

Constant help may be had from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. The use of a good historical atlas, e. g. C. G. Robertson and J. G. Bartholomew's *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*, published by the Oxford University Press, or Ramsay Muir's *New Historical Atlas*, published by Messrs. Philips, is essential.



THE ART OF PRIMITIVE MAN
Bushman Paintings from South Africa. (*Miss Helen Tongue*)



I

The Beginnings of History

The Making of the Earth. Countless ages ago the Sun, the Earth, and all the planets, with their moons, formed one huge mass of flaming gas. As it gradually cooled, this mass of incandescent gas, which was revolving rapidly, threw off fragments, which, gradually solidifying, became the planets and their moons. Being very much smaller than the parent-mass, these outlying members of the Solar System (as the whole is called) cooled much more rapidly than the Sun in the centre. Thus in time our Earth reached its present state. It has a hot interior with a hard and cool surface ; and it receives light and heat from the central mass (the Sun), which is still intensely hot. At first, whilst the earth was itself still very hot, all the water of the oceans was held in the atmosphere in the form of vast clouds of steam ; but, as the process of cooling went on, the steam was condensed in rain, and thus the oceans were formed.¹

The Beginnings of Life. It was probably on the shores of these warm oceans that, after many ages, Life first appeared. The manner of that appearance is still a complete mystery. The first living matter was probably a soft, jelly-like substance, without shell or bones, multiplying by means of subdivision. Later on, at the bottom of the sea, there were developed from this substance sea-weeds, shell-fish, crabs, worms, and at last fishes. Of many of these early forms of life we have fairly

¹ Some scientists now hold that the earth, together with the other planets, was formed by the violent coming together of immense numbers of cold meteorites (very small, wandering members of the Solar System, which when they enter the earth's atmosphere form what are called 'shooting stars'). The collisions of these meteorites caused great heat.

accurate knowledge to-day; for when the shell-fish (for instance) died, they left their hard shells embedded in the mud on the sea-floor. Then, as the rivers washed sand and silt down into the sea from the land, fresh layers of mud were formed above the remains of the old shell-fish. This mud was gradually hardened by the continually growing weight above, till it became rock. Then, after many ages, either some sudden earthquake, or slow changes in the distribution of weight elsewhere on the earth's crust, caused the mud-formed rocks at the bottom of the sea to be heaved up, so as to form part of the dry land, or even high mountain ranges. In this position the rocks were cut away by rivers and rain: and so in time the remains of the ancient shell-fish were disclosed. In this way we can find in large numbers the shells and bones of ancient creatures, embedded in the rocks. Such remains are called 'fossils'.

It is probable that at least a thousand million years have passed since, as the earth cooled, the first rocks were formed. Of this vast length of time at least half passed before any form of living creature was developed with parts hard enough to be preserved as fossils in the rocks.

The Evolution of Life. It is now generally believed that there has been one steady process of continuous development leading from the first minute beginnings of life right up to mankind. From time to time slight variations in the form and shape of individual creatures have given those individuals a better chance of defending themselves from their enemies, of obtaining food, and of rearing their young. Weaker and worse-equipped individuals on the other hand have tended to be killed or starved, and have failed to leave offspring. Thus, as a rule, the next generation has been chosen from the stronger and better equipped members of the previous generation; and so steady progress has taken place. New species of creatures may have come into existence either through sudden and great variations (called 'sports'), or through an accumulation of the slight variations mentioned




SOME PREHISTORIC BEASTS

1. Pareiasaurian ; 2. Rhynchocephalian ; 3. Thaumorph ; 4. Three-toed Skink ; 5. Diamond Snake ;
6. Elephant Tortoise ; 7. Crocodile ; 8. Dinosaur ; 9. Diplodocus ; 10. Triceratops ; 11. Iguanodon ;
12. Tylosaurus ; 13. Ichthyosaur ; 14. Plesiosaur ; 15. Pterodactyle.

above, or through slow changes of climate and other conditions, which have led to the survival of certain individuals only (e. g. those with whiter fur during a cold epoch), and thus at last to the development of a new species.

Again, certain individuals, born with peculiarities fitting them for existence under wholly different conditions, were probably the forerunners of new orders of life. The common frog gives in its own life-history an interesting illustration of a change of this kind ; for in its early stages it is a fish, whilst later on it becomes a land animal breathing air through its lungs.

The subject is, as yet imperfectly understood, especially in



PLESIOSAUR'S PADDLE (Dorchester Museum)

regard to the manner in which new developments are inherited. But, through the study of fossils and of the life-history of existing creatures, and in many other ways, a clear chain of progress can be traced leading from the first living creatures up to man himself.

Reptiles, Birds, and Mammals. Life, first in the form of plants, gradually emerged from the sea and found its home on the dry land. Great forests sprang up, flourished, and decayed. Their fossil remains give us our coal to-day. The highest form of animal life in these ancient forests took for many ages the form of insects, some of which were of gigantic size. Later appeared the first reptiles, the forerunners of our snakes and lizards and crocodiles. Some of these early reptiles were enormous creatures whose fossil remains show them to have been over a hundred feet long. Some of them ate leaves, and some flesh.

From the reptiles developed the birds, at first in the form of creatures resembling great bats, and without feathers or true wings, but with formidable teeth. Later, the true birds began to appear.

Then there must have come a sudden change of climate, due perhaps to variations in the earth's orbit and in the tilt of its axis. All, or almost all, the great reptiles disappeared. Probably they died because their scales could not protect them sufficiently during a period of intense cold. Their place was taken, perhaps after a very long interval, by large mammals.¹ During the age of reptiles the mammals had been developing; but they were probably no larger than



A Forest of the Coal Period

rats. When the great reptiles had gone, the mammals rapidly increased, showing a number of differing types. Some of

¹ A reptile lays eggs and has scales, but no hair. A mammal gives milk to its young, which are not born in eggs. The reptile, like the fish, is very careless about its young; but in the mammal the care of the parent for its young has been one of the most important influences in bringing about the development of higher and higher types.

hem (the whales) returned to the water, whilst others (the monkeys) took to the trees, according to the manner in which the pressure of circumstances or their predispositions directed them to seek the best method of survival. But nearly all these differing types of mammals were making progress in one supremely important direction—the development of a bigger brain, with which to grapple more effectively with their surroundings and with the problem of survival.

Some of the beasts which flourished in those far-off times were huge and terrible. Amongst them grew up—perhaps a million years ago—the direct ancestors of man himself, creatures which were much nearer to man than any of the animals at present existing in the world, but were still far below the lowest race of men of which we now have knowledge.

The Making of Man. We do not know how, when, or where man first developed on the earth. His original home may possibly have been in South-eastern Asia or in the adjacent islands. The form of his teeth, which are naturally suited for eating fruit and soft roots, is thought to show that he must have been evolved in a tropical climate, where such food is obtainable all the year round. We do not even know anything exact about the prehuman ancestors which connected early man with the rest of the animal kingdom. It is probable that his immediate ancestor was a large ape, whose hands and feet were not unlike those of a chimpanzee or gorilla, but which had stronger legs and shorter arms.

Some have felt that thus to trace the descent of man from the beasts is not only to degrade man himself but to dishonour God who made him. But in reality the modern discoveries of the manner in which our race has been patiently built up reveal a more wonderful method of creation than was dreamed of before those discoveries were made. In showing something of the manner in which God has made the world and its inhabitants, Science teaches us, more than was ever possible before, to marvel at God's wisdom and skill.

The First Traces of Man. In Java the fossilized bones of a creature half ape and half man have been discovered, embedded in layers of soil whose nature points to this creature having been alive perhaps half a million years ago. In Europe very simple stone implements have been found in large numbers, dating back to about the same period. They are hand-axes ; and it seems probable that they were made, to hammer or fight with, by half-men of a similar kind to the creature whose bones have been found in Java.

Then comes a gap of some quarter of a million years before we again find definite traces of primitive man. The next clear evidence we have consists of some bones found near Heidelberg in Germany. They are far more like a man's bones than are those of the creature found in Java ; but it is improbable that the jaw could have been used for human speech. We know that at the same period as this ' man of Heidelberg ' there lived in Europe huge tigers, lions, elephants, rhinoceroses, and bison.

Next comes another gap in our knowledge, extending for about one hundred thousand years. Then we have a skull, found at Piltdown in Sussex, of a creature with a brain capacity intermediate between that of the Java man and that of the man of to-day. Its very ape-like jaw makes it probable that this creature was not a direct ancestor of man, but formed one of many side developments which were not so well equipped as their rivals for success in the struggle for existence, and which therefore in course of time became extinct, as had the reptiles and mammals.

The first traces of early man that are certainly human date from about fifty thousand years ago. They were found in a valley called the Neanderthal, in Germany. This Neanderthal man could not stand erect, nor hold his head straight up. He had no chin, and perhaps could not speak ; his face was still very ape-like ; but his brain capacity was at least twice that of any ape, and he must be classed as a man and not as

a beast. We have many bones and other traces of this Neanderthal race of early men, found in various parts of Europe and in Africa. In some cases the body had been properly buried, with food and tools ready to hand, as if in readiness for another life. 'These men of the Neanderthal type are doubtless ape-like in their head form up to a certain



A type of Early Man

point. . . . And yet they were men enough, had brains enough to believe in a life after death.' ¹

Thus we have at last come to man, after the innumerable ages of slow and painful development from the first beginnings of life upon the earth. Every step upward had been bought—in a grim struggle for food and survival—through the death of countless individuals, and the extinction of whole species. It was a process of wholesale sacrifice, of incalculable suffering

Marett, *Anthropology*, p. 79.

and agony, creature preying upon creature and race upon race. We are beginning to understand that two of the main factors in survival were the willingness of the mother to sacrifice herself for her offspring, and the ability of a group of creatures to co-operate for the purposes of obtaining food and protection. Mother-love and the spirit of brotherhood were already of immense importance in the development of higher and higher forms of life, ages before man had himself been formed.

† *Palaeolithic Man*. The early races of men were clever at the making of stone implements of various kinds. They took fragments of flint, and chipped their surfaces into a regular shape, leaving a sharp edge for cutting. They did not, however, polish these tools. We call these men 'Palaeolithic' men, or men of the old stone age.

The life of these first true men, perhaps fifty thousand years ago, was very hard. Their world was inhabited by fierce animals. Their right to the caves in which they lived was contested by huge cave-lions and cave-bears. The climate was steadily becoming colder, as the earth's axis assumed a more and more marked tilt. A great Ice Age was coming on, when large parts of the earth were covered deeply by glaciers, as Greenland and Spitzbergen still are. But an enormous step towards civilization had already been made in the discovery and use of fire. It is unlikely that these men hunted animals bigger than hares or rabbits; probably they were hunted quite as much as they were hunters. They ate fruits, birds' eggs, frogs, fish, snakes, and so on; and were probably not particular as to whether their food was fresh or half rotten. But they must already have had the beginnings of chieftainship, and of social life in packs or small tribes.

† *The Cro-magnards*. When the Ice Ages once more gave place to a warmer climate (i. e. when the tilt of the earth's axis in relation to its orbit became less marked), a new and higher type of man began to appear in Europe. Probably this new


race had grown up separately from its forerunners, the Neanderthal men. Perhaps its first home was in lands now submerged beneath the Mediterranean Sea. The new-comers were far more highly developed—far more truly men—than the Neanderthal people. Indeed some of the members of this race (called the ‘Cro-magnards’¹) had bigger brains than the men of to-day. These were great hunters, especially of horses, which they ate,² but probably did not ride. Indeed up to this point animals had not yet been tamed. One thing these Cro-magnards could do extremely well. They made admirable pictures, especially of animals. Many of these pictures, which have been found in deep caves, and were possibly drawn for some religious purpose, are splendidly outlined and coloured, and are full of life and movement. The Cro-magnards also made fine engravings and carvings on bones and antlers. They buried their dead elaborately, evidently with the expectation of a future life. In their period and that of their kindred races—a period which extended down to perhaps fifteen thousand years ago—Europe³ was largely covered with broad open grasslands, over which grazed herds of reindeer and horses.

¹ *Neolithic Man*. Then came another great change in the climate. Europe became steadily warmer and damper, and was gradually covered with large forests. Amongst those forests we find another race of men appearing in place of the steppe dwellers, those hunters of the horse and the reindeer who had gone before. This race had a new and higher type of skill in the manufacture of stone implements; and hence they are called the men of the Neolithic (new stone) age. Their tools were beautifully made, and differ from those of

¹ From Cro-Magnon in France, where their skeletons were first discovered.


² At one of their camps the bones of some 100,000 horses have been found.

³ It is only in Europe (and to a lesser extent in North America) that the relics of prehistoric man have been at all carefully investigated.



ICE-AGE SCENERY—SPITZBERGEN

the Old Stone men in being polished. The New Stone men could not make pictures like those of the Cro-magnards, but they had made the great advance towards civilization of beginning to till the ground. Probably they used a system of shifting cultivation—sometimes working a plot here, sometimes there—such as is still practised by some primitive jungle tribes in India. They had also tamed the dog, the cow, the sheep, and the goat; and they knew how to make pottery. They used gold for ornaments; and after a time



Asiatic

RACIAL TYPES

American

they began to make their tools and weapons of copper and bronze in place of stone. Bronze is a mixture of copper and tin, and much harder than either. Finally, perhaps about three thousand years ago, iron came into use, being smelted at first over charcoal fires. A rough kind of barter trade between peoples far apart sprang up in gold, amber, and hard kinds of stone. In Europe at this time many Neolithic peoples lived in elaborately made settlements built on piles fixed in the beds of lakes. In these lake villages the inhabitants were secure from the attacks of wild beasts or of enemy tribes.


The Races of Mankind. The Old Stone men had ranged far

and wide over the earth, and the relics which they have left show them to have attained everywhere to somewhat the same level of development. But the New Stone men were different. All over the world we find them becoming divided into distinct races, each with its own physical peculiarity (colour of the skin, shape of the head, nature of the hair), with its own level of civilization, and its own group of languages.

Over north-eastern Europe and north-western Asia ¹ there



European



African

RACIAL TYPES

spread the Northern Caucasian race or races, consisting of white men, who led a wandering life in the forests and on the steppes, and spoke what are known as the Aryan languages.²

In eastern Asia and America, which was then probably joined to Asia, was the yellowish Mongolian race, speaking a quite distinct family of languages. In Africa and other tropical regions was the black Negro race, with many forms of speech.


¹ North-western Asia was then probably separated from southern Asia by a great inland sea, the traces of which still exist in the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea, and the Aral Sea.

² In the Aryan group are included Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and most living European languages.

Between the Northern Caucasians and the Negroes lived the Southern Caucasian (or Mediterranean) race, brownish in colour, with black hair, and speaking various languages, amongst which the Semitic group is the most important. This Southern Caucasian race spread far and wide. It may have given her Dravidian inhabitants to India. It may even have reached almost round the earth, coming to Central and South America from the west, across the islands of the Pacific.

Besides these great groups there were other races and other families of languages, but the whole subject of the division of races and languages is very difficult and uncertain.

The Aryans. We may be fairly certain that at the dawn of history the Northern Caucasian or Aryan race—as it may be conveniently but inaccurately called, from its languages—was making rapid advances both southward and westward, at the expense of the Southern Caucasians. In the west these advancing Aryans were the Celts, who finally reached the Atlantic, driving before them the conquered populations into the extreme west of England, France, and the Spanish peninsula. Later, as we shall see, the Aryan tribes pressed under various names into Italy, Greece, Persia, and India. They came with their household goods piled up in wagons drawn by oxen. Cattle were highly prized, and were the chief form of wealth. When they came to wide rivers or arms of the sea the advancing Aryans made themselves boats to cross in. They built their ~~houses of wood, and burnt their dead.~~ At first they lived chiefly by their cattle, as they had done from time immemorial in their wandering past; but later they settled down in their new homes in west and south, and took to agriculture, using for the plough the oxen which had dragged their wagons when they were still migrating. Everywhere they brought with them the old songs which for ages had been sung at their feasts and religious ceremonies. Hence arose the Sagas in the north-west, the Epics in Greece, the Zendavesta in Persia,



THE TUNDRA LANDS OF SIBERIA. Reindeer on a drift of Snow

and the Vedic hymns in India. Thus the Aryans brought with them the beginnings of literature and history and philosophy, though as yet there was no writing, everything being handed down by word of mouth and carefully committed to memory by the young priest or bard. These ancient Aryans were divided not into single households, but into big joint families, which may sometimes have contained hundreds of individuals. Such families were grouped together into tribes, each owning allegiance to a common chieftain, and often engaged in warfare with each other. As the Aryans settled down in their new homes, each tribe would occupy its own section of the country, and its various families would settle into villages.

The Nomads. In the lands of northern and eastern Europe and west-central Asia, from which the Aryans had come, there were more Aryans left. After the Ice Ages the climate of the earth had been becoming steadily warmer. At first there had been cold and barren steppes, such as still exist in northern Siberia. Then there had come a period of heavy rainfall, when forests had sprung up. Later, there began a steady process of drying-up and of increasing warmth. The forests gradually receded, and gave place to immense grasslands, which tended slowly to become more and more dry, and therefore to yield less and less grass. The tribes in these regions were dependent on their cattle, and therefore upon grass. Hence, whilst the Aryans who had migrated westward and southward were settling down into civilized life on the rich and fertile lands of southern and western Europe and southern Asia, these other Aryans, who had remained behind, were being forced to take up a constantly more wandering, or 'nomadic' life, in search of grass for their cattle. They lived in tents made of skin, or sometimes even in the great wagons which they used to transport their goods from place to place. Many of them subsisted almost entirely on the milk of mares. As the climate became drier, the wanderings



The skin dwellings of the Mongolians

of the nomadic tribes extended more widely. Moreover, as their numbers and those of their beasts increased, the supply of grass became less, since there were more mouths to consume the diminishing supplies. This is only one instance of that process which has been at work from the first beginnings



Mongolian tribes on the move

of life on the earth—the struggle for existence and survival. The tribes of the steppes, as had happened innumerable times before in the evolution of their prehuman ancestors, were driven by diminishing food-supply and (later) by the remorseless pressure of enemies—in this case Mongolian tribes from the east—to seek relief in a new direction, and thereby profoundly to affect the course of history. For thousands of years we find a constant tendency of the nomads from

northern and eastern Europe and west-central Asia to follow their brethren in invading and conquering the west and the south.

At first these invaders were all Aryans ; but after a time the Aryans began to be pushed from behind by Mongolian peoples from north-eastern Asia. These Mongolian nomads were urged forward by the same causes that had unsettled the Aryans, and also by the building up of a strong civilized government in China. Thus in time Mongolian tribes, Huns and Turks and Moguls and many others, begin to appear as invaders of the west and south, treading on the heels of the Aryans, whom they had been driving before them.

The drying-up of Central Asia has thus been an event of capital importance in the history of the world. On its great steppes were reared an unending supply of hardy peoples, both Aryan and Mongolian, whose migrations profoundly affected other lands and their populations.

*The Beginnings of Civilization.*¹ But we have been advancing too fast. Probably long before the first southward and westward movement of the Aryans, the Southern Caucasian race had achieved a high degree of culture in a number of different regions ; and it must be remembered that the Aryans came first as savage destroyers of older culture.

Mankind first reached real culture—organized power, accumulated wealth, recorded knowledge, and artistic skill—in Egypt and Mesopotamia, in the extremely rich and fertile lands watered by the Nile, the Tigris, and the Euphrates—lands where a little labour expended in cultivating the soil could afford permanent support to a large population.


Mesopotamia. In the lower part of the Tigris-Euphrates basin, where wheat even grew wild, the first real cities of the world came into existence. Canals were made, elaborate cultivation was developed. Large temples were built. A high

¹ The distinction between civilization and culture will be discussed in the next chapter.


degree of prosperity was achieved, and finally a great empire appeared, covering the whole of Mesopotamia. This is called the empire of the Sumerians, and it began to flourish somewhere between 6000 and 5000 B. C. The Sumerians were probably the first men to develop writing. For a long period this writing was only in a very rough and clumsy form—a modification of savage picture-writing, such as is still found amongst backward peoples, and in which rude pictures are made of the things which it is desired to represent. Later on this Sumerian Empire was conquered by Semitic (not Aryan) nomads from Arabia, who came in successive waves, the first invaders being called the Akkadians. Later the Akkadians were followed by the Assyrians and the Chaldaeans. These invaders built up strong empires of their own, defended and extended by great armies, and with a powerful central government. It is clear, therefore, that an advanced stage had already been attained in the development of human society. Men had learnt to combine into wide-reaching communities. The stage of the hunting pack and the nomadic tribe had indeed been definitely passed thousands of years before the forerunners of the Aryans appeared in Mesopotamia. Finally in 539 B. C. these Aryans (the Medes and Persians) overthrew the Chaldaean Empire, and founded an empire of their own—the Persian.

During the period of about five thousand years from the foundation of the Sumerian Empire to the fall of the Chaldaean Empire before the Aryans, a high degree of culture had been reached in this fertile and prosperous region. Iron had been introduced, as had wheeled vehicles. Trade had developed far and wide. Magnificent palaces and cities had arisen, decorated with splendid sculptures. A certain amount of literature had even been produced, though it was handicapped by the clumsy manner of writing and by the lack of proper materials to write upon.¹


¹ The Sumerian script was developed from a rude form of picture-



SUMERIA. Ruins of the palace at Kish; about 3500 B. C.




Ruins of Ancient Babylon, 7th century B. C.



A Ghufa, the oldest form of craft in the world, crossing the Tigris

Egypt. Meanwhile a somewhat similar type of culture had been flourishing in Egypt. The dry climate has served as a magnificent preserver of the relics of that culture. The tombs and temples containing these relics are found scattered in vast numbers up and down the valley of the Nile—the great river whose annual overflow serves Egypt instead of rain, and makes a narrow strip of country on both banks extraordinarily fertile. The examination of the most ancient tombs shows a people still savage, and apparently accustomed to eat parts of the bodies of their dead friends. But by 5000 B.C. the Egyptians were already working stone, using bronze instruments, and practising a system of picture-writing almost as good as, but quite different from, that of the Sumerians of the same age.




An Egyptian Scribe, 5th dynasty

Egypt, besides being extremely fertile, is protected on its land frontiers by wide stretches of desert from the invasion of enemies. Thus her culture could develop undisturbed. Its progress was aided by the inestimable boon of the papyrus-paper for writing material. The Egyptians attained a wonderful pitch of achievement in many directions, especially in art and engineering. Colossal and magnificent buildings sprang up, chiefly temples and tombs, of which the most famous and wonderful are the pyramids of Giza, which date from as far back as about 3700 B.C. The Egyptians, like the peoples of Mesopotamia, developed a fine type of sculpture. They also

writing, at first on stone and subsequently on clay tablets. Straight lines drawn on the soft clay with a pointed instrument tended to become wedge-shaped, and the writing thus became conventional groups of wedges, whence the name 'cuneiform'.



MEMPHIS. Sacred lake



THE NILE. Gebel abu Feda. Cliff of Tombs



KARNAK. Papyrus-bud columns in Festal Temple of
Thothmes III

made very skilful and beautiful paintings. They had an elaborate religious system, centring round the worship of a large number of divinities, some tribal gods, some nature-gods (as the sun-god), many of them represented in human



Egyptian Infantry on the March. 12th dynasty



Semites made captive by the Egyptians

or animal form. They also made great progress in various sciences, especially astronomy.

The Egyptian Empire endured, with various periods of invasion from Arabia and Mesopotamia, and again of expansion and conquest in those directions, until the time of the great Greek conqueror, Alexander the Great, who subdued Egypt and made it a part of his Greek Empire.



EGYPTIAN SCULPTURE. A Prince and Princess of the Old Kingdom

Crete. A third form of culture originated in the Mediterranean island of Crete, perhaps about the same time as those in Egypt and Mesopotamia. It is called the Minoan¹ culture, and it spread to Greece, Italy, and other Mediterranean lands. It differed from the cultures of Egypt and Mesopotamia, which were based on fertile river valleys, in being a sea-going and trading culture. By 3500 B. C. the Cretans were already practised sailors and merchants. Later, during a long period




The sacred bull of Crete
A fountain-head from Cnossos

of peaceful expansion, they developed a high degree of artistic and architectural skill. Their pottery, textile manufactures, sculpture, and painting, together with their work in gems, ivory, and metals, are as worthy of admiration as those produced by man in any age.


During recent years some ruins of the great palaces which were built by Minoan kings and nobles have been discovered and carefully excavated. They were magnificent buildings, stately, complex, and luxurious; they contain water-pipes, bathrooms, and similar conveniences, and are as admirable from the point of view of comfort as any produced in the ancient world. Sometime before 1000 B. C. this Cretan Empire was conquered and largely destroyed, probably by the advancing Aryans, who in this case were the Hellenes or Greeks.

The Phoenicians. Long before the final fall of the Minoan power another trading and seafaring people had come into prominence in the Mediterranean region. These were the Phoenicians, who belonged to the Semitic branch of the Southern Caucasian race. They had originally come as invading nomads from Arabia, and settled on the coast of Syria, where their most important town was Tyre. This

¹ From Minos, the legendary King of Crete.



CRETE. Hall of Columns and Staircase, Cnossos



CRETE. Store-room leading out of Great Corridor, Cnossos



CRETAN ORNAMENT

became a flourishing centre of overseas commerce; for the Phoenicians were fine merchants and sailors. They established many trading posts on the shores of the Mediterranean, and even beyond the Strait of Gibraltar. Some of these trading posts developed into important states, notably the Phoenician colony of Carthage, which by 500 B. C. was a great naval power, whose ships explored and traded far down the west



PHOENICIA THE SEA POWER. Entrance to the Port of
Motya, an island off Sicily

coast of Africa, and north as far as England. Carthage was also a big industrial centre, with flourishing manufactures, especially of textile goods. She worked mines in Spain, and even traded across the Sahara desert with the negro peoples of Central Africa.

Phoenician sailors, starting from the Gulf of Suez, are said on one occasion to have sailed right round Africa. They took three years for the voyage, supporting themselves by landing each year, planting wheat, and waiting till it was ripe enough to cut before moving on. It is probable that Phoenicians also carried on a regular trade with India and Ceylon.

To these Phoenicians we owe a most precious invention, the alphabetical system of writing, in which the written signs are not pictures of things or ideas, as in the earlier forms of writing, but correspond to the sounds made in ordinary speaking.

The Jews. Kindred to the Phoenicians were another Semitic people, the Jews. They also had originally been nomads of Arabia, whence they had emigrated first to Mesopotamia, later to Egypt, and finally to Palestine, where they became permanently settled, probably about twelve hundred years before Christ. The Jewish people was a small one, and it had a very chequered career; it was frequently conquered by its neighbours of Egypt and Mesopotamia, between which great and powerful empires it had the misfortune to occupy a midway position. Only for a brief period, in the ninth century before Christ, did the Jews attain anything like military strength and material greatness. This was under the two strong kings David and Solomon. After this short epoch of prosperity the Jewish kingdom split in two, and was later easily reduced by Assyria and Chaldaea. The people were enslaved, and great numbers of them were carried off into captivity in Mesopotamia and beyond.

As we shall see hereafter, the civilization of the Jews, in spite of their weakness in comparison with the great empires by which they were surrounded, is of the very highest importance, not for its material achievements, but for the great moral and religious ideas which sprang up amongst this little people, and for the great prophets who gave utterance to those ideas.

China. Meanwhile, far away on the other side of Asia, there was developing amongst the Mongolian peoples settled in China another type of culture, totally distinct from any developed amongst the Southern Caucasian peoples which we have just been considering.

In China, as in Mesopotamia and Egypt, fertile river-

valleys invited men at a very early period to take up a settled manner of life, and gave the settlers the means of prosperity and progress. By 2000 B. C. there was a large Chinese Empire. Bronze was known and was beautifully worked. Iron became common about 500 B. C. ; and by 100 B. C. Chinese culture and organization, backed by a strong central government



An early Chinese bronze


















































and powerful armies, were spreading steadily westward, pressing back the Mongolian nomad tribes on the fringe of the empire.

Long before this time the Chinese had developed an elaborate system of picture-writing ; but this remained, and still remains, extremely clumsy. An extensive literature sprang up, much of it full of wisdom and beauty. Great canals and fine buildings were constructed. The population

of the empire increased very rapidly. A stable and prosperous social system was developed, which still endures ; and the administration of the huge territory covered by the empire was elaborately organized.

Conclusion. We have thus completed a very brief review of the growth of our race from the earliest beginnings of life, through the long ages of prehuman evolution, and of prehistoric savagery, up to a point at which a wide degree of culture has been attained in two separate areas of the earth—in Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean basin, and in China.


We have seen that by far the longest periods of the history

Sumerian	Old Babylonian	Old Chinese	Hittite	Minoan	Egyptian
					
					
					
					
					
					
					
					
Assyrian (Cuneiform)					
					

SOME EARLY FORMS OF WRITING

The first column shows characters in the Sumerian linear script, the second the old Babylonian (cuneiform) development of them (N.B., the Babylonian signs are turned left upon their side in accord with later practice), the third the old Chinese equivalents of the same characters. The characters in the other columns bear no relation to each other, and are intended to show only the general features of the scripts.

of mankind are hidden in darkness—darkness through which we can dimly discern fierce and perpetual conflict with the beasts, with starvation, and with hostile tribes. We have seen how, with the gradual warming of the earth's climate after the great Ice Ages, the New Stone men began to make definite progress ; how different races of these men can be distinguished ; how the Northern Caucasians or Aryans amongst the forests and on the steppes were gradually forced, as their own lands grew drier, to a more and more nomadic type of life ; how they finally migrated, in great waves of invasion, into the richer lands where the Southern Caucasians had already developed, in a number of different centres, a very advanced degree of culture. We have briefly glanced at these ancient types of culture, centred firstly on fertile river-valleys, and secondly round the basin of the Mediterranean Sea, and growing later into widespread empires based either on land power and conquest or on sea power and commerce. Finally we have noticed the separate and independent development of the strongly marked Chinese culture.



Pottery of the Iron Age



II

The Meaning of Civilization : India and China

What is Civilization ? As we proceed to study in more detail the history of mankind during the past two or three thousand years, we shall find that civilization tends to make progress chiefly in those lands where the Aryan race—still in a more or less nomadic stage of development—comes into contact with more settled and cultured Southern Caucasian peoples. China is an exception which must be treated separately.

But first we must try to make up our minds as to what are the signs of true civilization, as distinguished either from primitive savagery or from a merely material 'culture'.

Man has inherited from his prehuman ancestors a number of instincts,¹ which still underlie the life and activity both of individuals and of associations of men, though these may be unconscious of their influence. Such instincts bid men shun death and strive to keep themselves alive. They bid men strive to keep the race alive through bringing up children. They bid men resist anything which threatens their safety or that of their children and friends. They bid men associate themselves together, into family and tribe and nation, in order the better to obtain self-preservation and security.

Now the process of civilization consists in the free, conscious, and willing subjugation of these great primitive

¹ Instincts are 'innate or inherited tendencies which are the essential springs or motive powers of all thought and action, whether individual or collective, and are the bases from which the character and will of individuals and of nations are gradually developed' (McDougall, *Social Psychology*, p. 19).

instincts, and of the activities to which they give origin, to the service of wider and wider associations of men, and finally to the service of humanity as a whole. Thus civilization is a spiritual thing, involving freedom and conscious service and self-subordination. Culture, on the other hand, may be merely material and selfish, and though showing vast wealth and irresistible power and wide learning, may be utterly devoid of the spirit of freedom and service. Yet, though this is so, civilization can hardly exist apart from a certain standard of culture, without which the knowledge and the means of communication needful for a wide and freely given service of humanity can hardly be attained.

Amongst the beasts instinct often works unchecked. A tiger seizes its prey as it needs it, and fights its enemies as it meets them. A tigress cares for and rears her cubs as best she may. They live in solitude. But many beasts, for instance wolves, live in packs, thus securing better protection for themselves and their young, better chances of obtaining food, and more power in fighting. Such packs are often led by the strongest male beast. Early man also once lived in packs led by the strongest male. This pack-life in itself means that a check is put on the unrestrained working of instinct, or at least that more primitive instincts are subordinated to more developed instincts. Except under dire stress of hunger the pack-members do not kill and eat each other. Fighting within the pack—at any rate fighting to the death—is generally discouraged by the leading male, who in other ways also restricts the play of instinct in his companions. Apart from pack-life, many of the beasts show definite beginnings of home-life, the male helping the female in her care for their young.

The history of mankind is the history of the manner in which larger and larger 'packs' have been formed, and in which the right balance has been found between the interests of these continually enlarging associations and the interests

of the individuals and families which make them up. True freedom, which is the fullest fruit of civilization, and whose development forms in the highest sense the subject-matter of history, is the state in which each individual can best serve the whole of humanity by the deliberate subordination to that service of all his instincts and all his activities.

It is possible that the ancient peoples which we have already briefly considered had gone far towards the foundation of a true form of civilization, judged by this high standard of freedom and service. In Egypt, Crete, Mesopotamia, China, and elsewhere, there were large communities of men who had been living for thousands of years a life that must in the main have been peaceful and united, prosperous and disciplined. This means that the ideals of freedom and service must in some measure have been realized in those ancient states. Unfortunately, however, the imperfect acquaintance of the peoples in question with the art of writing prevents our knowing more than a very little about their achievements in this direction. We can only catch glimpses here and there of their true life. Their material triumphs—their tombs and palaces and temples and so on—wonderful though they are, do not form a safe guide in judging of advance towards true civilization. For such signs of culture are outward and material, whilst, as we have just seen, civilization is inward and spiritual, depending on the realization of the ideals of freedom and service.

In any case these ancient communities and empires were, comparatively speaking, isolated and scattered. They were oases in wide deserts of savagery. It was impossible for men in that early dawn of history to serve, or even to conceive of, humanity as a whole.


The Aryan Settlers. With the coming of the Aryans, and the development of better methods of writing, the scene begins to change. It is easier to recognize and estimate the progress of mankind towards freedom and true civilization, and to

determine what contribution great nations and great individual men have made towards that progress.

It was probably for defence in warfare that the invading Aryans made their first settlements. These were merely rough stockades, inside which the tribe could be gathered in time of danger, and around which cultivation came to be more and more thoroughly practised. Thus, where the soil was rich, and grass around the settlement plentiful, the nomadic life of Central Asia was abandoned for settled village life.

The tribes were led by chieftains, as the packs ages before had been led by the strongest male. Obedience was paid to the chieftain as the head of the tribe and the embodiment of the tribal spirit. The tribe-members would willingly fight and die for him and for the tribe. But the chieftain was not in any sense an absolute monarch. He was perhaps elected by, and certainly relied a great deal upon, a rough kind of Council of Elders, composed of the heads of the families included in the tribe. He was surrounded in war and peace by these principal men of the tribe, who were his companions and equals rather than subordinates, he being merely the bravest and richest and most honoured among them. He knew that if he disregarded their advice and used his position to misgovern the tribe, they would probably depose him and set some one else up in his place.

The Aryan tribes, when they appear in history both in Europe and in Asia, are marked by this type of tribal organization and of chieftainship controlled by the heads of the families. As they settled down into village life, the power of the chieftain generally tended to increase, and to be handed on from father to son. Thus, generally speaking, the authority of the Council of Elders diminished. However these nobles, as they came to be, usually made up for their loss in this direction by the increased authority which a settled life gave them over the subordinate members of their own families and the survivors of conquered races, who were settled on the estates granted by the chieftain to the nobles and their families.




From Nomad life to Settlement in Arabia

A peaceful life on rich country tended to increase the power of the King, as the chieftain came to be, chiefly in the following way. Prosperous farmers were much less willing than nomadic horsemen had been to leave everything and follow the King to war. Hence, in order to obtain the troops required to protect the tribe and the lands which it had acquired, the King would take a tax from the tribesmen, instead of calling on them to fight in person ; and with the proceeds of this tax he would hire soldiers. These hired soldiers, being paid by him, were more obedient and disciplined than the tribal array had been. The King often used these hired soldiers not only to conquer fresh lands for the tribe, but also to make his own authority absolute within the tribe itself. This process took place sooner or later in almost all countries where the invading Aryans settled.

The Aryans in India. When the Aryan invaders reached India, perhaps about 1300 B. C., they found there Dravidian peoples already well established and far advanced towards culture. These Dravidians may have come in from the west thousands of years before, during the eastward expansion round the world of the Southern Caucasian race. They may also have found Negro tribes already in possession of India. But the whole subject is very obscure.

The Aryans were light-coloured. When they came as conquerors amongst the much darker Dravidians, conquerors and conquered were distinguished by colour, as well as by the fact that the former were masters, and the latter, when they could be caught, slaves. Thus there was developed a colour-bar between the races.

Amongst the Aryans a class-system had already developed. It had become the custom for each man to have his own especial service to perform for the tribe, either as ruler, or noble, or priest, or worker in the fields and amongst the cattle. With a settled and peaceful life these services tended to become hereditary. The King's son became King in his turn ;




BUDDHISM. The North Gate of the Great Stūpa at Sānchī (in the Bhopal State), built about 150 B.C.

the noble's son became a noble. These belonged to the Kshatriya class. The priest's son became a priest ; and the Brahman class developed. The farmer's son became a farmer, and so on, these common people being classed as Vaisyas. Beneath the colour-bar the conquered Dravidians formed a medley of classes, each tending to have some special service to perform, and to become a hereditary caste whose members followed their fathers' forms of occupation. They were grouped together as Sudras. In time the whole class-system was hardened, under the sanction of religion, into a vast organization of castes, the bar between each of which was almost as clear and definite as the original colour-bar between white Aryan freeman and black Dravidian slave. This colour-bar gave its name to the whole system ; for the word for colour in Sanskrit, the language of the Aryan invaders of India, also means ' caste '.

The caste-system, whilst it embodied the idea of service performed by the individual for the community, failed to make that service free and willing. It set up rigid barriers between man and man, and it condemned the great mass of the population of India to perpetual inferiority and subjection. In time it spread over the whole land, right down to the extreme south.

Buddha. Perhaps the greatest man ever born in India was Gautama Buddha (born about 550 B. C.), the son of one of the chiefs of the Sakya tribe, which was settled in north India. Although he died nearly five centuries before the beginning of the Christian era, Buddha had reached in his own ideals true freedom and true civilization. For he gave himself and all that he had to the free and willing service of mankind, seeking a means of escape from the pain and misery of all human life, and a bond of unity that would draw together men of all castes and tribes and races. This means of escape and bond of unity he found in the new gospel which he preached—the gospel of benevolence and self-conquest.



A BUDDHIST CAVE-TEMPLE. Ajanta Cave 26 excavated between A.D. 500 and 642

Two of the 'Noble Truths' which he proclaimed run as follows :

' *The noble truth of the origin of misery.* It is desire leading to rebirth, joining itself to pleasure and passion, and finding delight in every existence—desire namely for sensual pleasure, desire for permanent existence, desire for transitory existence.'

' *The noble truth of the cessation of misery.* It is the complete fading out and cessation of this desire, a giving up, a loosing hold, a relinquishment, and a non-adhesion.' ¹

In this doctrine of the subjugation of Desire, coupled with the teaching of active kindness towards every creature, there came amongst men the ideal of a willing subjugation of instinct to the service of the world.

The Revolt against Caste. Implicit in the wide benevolence of Buddha was a protest against the barriers raised between man and man by the caste-system. In this and in other respects the true history of India is the history of the progress of the great ideals thus proclaimed by her noblest son, for the great influence which India has exercised on the world has been of a spiritual rather than of a political and 'practical' nature. Although caste still exists, and still divides the Indian population into a multitude of separate communities, there has been through the centuries a series of great leaders who, by declaring that in the sight of God all men are equal, have kept alive the ideal of loyalty to a larger and wider whole than the caste-group.


In our own day the revolt against caste is stronger in India than ever before. It has been broadened to include a campaign against caste in the social sphere, shown in the effort to promote cordial social relationships of all kinds between the members of different castes.

The Battle against Desire. Thus the teaching of Buddha regarding a wide benevolence towards all mankind has never been forgotten in India. Nor has his teaching regarding the


¹ Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, p. 63.



GAUTAMA BUDDHA



A Buddhist Monastery in Tibet




Buddhist Monks at Prayer in a Tibetan Monastery


necessity of combating Desire. This teaching has indeed been repeated and re-emphasized a hundred times by the long line of illustrious spiritual leaders which stretches from his day to our own. It is not too much to say that the conquest of Desire has been at the heart of the teaching of all the chief Indian schools of thought and of religion. They have taught more and more plainly that men must forsake the service of themselves, and the gratifying of their own selfish instincts and cravings, if they would attain sainthood and salvation.

Other Aspects of Indian History. Apart from its spiritual achievements, and from certain periods of political unity, of which the most noteworthy are those under the great Buddhist emperor Asoka (272-231 B. C.) and the great Moslem emperor Akbar (A. D. 1556-1605), the history of India is a long record of civil warfare and of foreign invasion. After the first Aryan invaders had settled down into a solid and permanent social organization, and had developed a remarkable degree of material culture (in addition to the spiritual discoveries which we have already noticed), there came fresh Aryan inroads from Persia and Greece and Central Asia. Then came the Mongolian invasions of the Yueh-Chi (or Kushans) and the Huns, who were following the Aryans westward and southward. Then came Semitic conquerors from Arabia and Afghanistan, who brought with them their religion of Islam, and built up a succession of Moslem kingdoms in northern and central India. Then came fresh Mongolian invaders, the Turks and Moguls, who built up the powerful and magnificent Mogul Empire. Finally came the modern Europeans, at first to trade and later to govern. The anarchy which followed the break-up of the Mogul Empire gradually led to the development of a great British dominion.

During the past century India has been brought under the world-wide influence of Western thought. Her people have begun ardently to desire freedom in its Western forms, and



A Mogul Emperor and his Court




THE TAJ MAHAL

to-day the power is being transferred from the hands of British officials to the hands of Indian assemblies. If the men exercising this power be imbued with the great spiritual ideals of the past, there is hope that India may give the world the example of a higher and nobler freedom than it has yet seen.

Before passing on, brief mention must be made of the achievements of the Indian artistic genius in poetry, sculpture, and above all architecture. Probably the most beautiful building in the world is the Taj Mahal at Agra, built by the great Mogul emperor Shah Jahan (A. D. 1628-58) as a tomb for his beloved empress. In science and mathematics India has also, from ancient times, done very noteworthy work.

The History of China. In the Far East the culture of China grew and expanded, untroubled by the Aryan inroads which almost everywhere else beat like a hammer on the anvil of the ancient peoples, welding harshly, by stroke on stroke, the first recorded forms of genuine and vigorous civilization. It is true that, to the north of China, there dwelt the wild nomadic Huns, who from time to time made raids into the settled lands of the empire. To exclude these Huns the Great Wall was built in the third century before Christ, extending for fourteen hundred miles along the frontier from the sea to the high mountains. But the Huns, unlike the Aryans, never came to settle. They were destroyers only, though in time they took on a superficial tinge of Chinese culture. Finally, under the strong Han dynasty (about 200 B. C. to A. D. 200), the power of China became great enough to push the Huns right back to the westward, where in their turn they drove forward the Aryans upon Europe and south-western Asia. The first Mongolian race to enter the West under this thrust from China was the Yueh-Chi, who about a century and a half before the birth of Christ crossed the great barrier-range between eastern and western Asia, and invaded Western Turkestan. Later on, the advancing power of China itself



THE GREAT WALL OF CHINA as it crosses the Nankow Pass with protecting towers every 200 yards

crossed the barrier. Before it the Huns and other Mongolian nomads were steadily driven westward, until in Armenia the Mongolians came into contact with the Romans. Finally, a great Chinese general reached the Caspian Sea, and for a brief period that sea alone stood between the empires of Rome and of China ; but then disorder and degeneration set in, and the Chinese power ebbed rapidly eastward.

Under the strong Tang dynasty, in the seventh century after Christ, the Chinese Empire was again extended to the Caspian, and was steadily consolidated in a long period of peace and prosperity. The Sung and Ming dynasties (between which came a great invasion of China by the nomad Tartars) were especially noteworthy and glorious. The last named fell, in the seventeenth century, to invaders from Manchuria, who have ruled China till, in our own day, a republic was set up.

The Limitations of Chinese Civilization. The clumsy and difficult Chinese script fatally handicapped the spread of education, and kept political power in the hands of a small class of men who were rich and leisured enough to acquire learning. Yet, in spite of this grievous handicap, the Chinese made marvellous progress in art and science. They built up a great and prosperous foreign commerce, and were the first to invent the mariner's compass, gunpowder, and printing.

In the sixth century B. C. lived Confucius ; he taught the need for a noble and well-ordered life, regulating the details of human relationship to an extreme degree. He exercised a powerful influence on the development of Chinese character. At a later date Buddhism permeated China, spreading very widely.

The very peacefulness of China, and her comparative immunity from foreign invasion, tended to stagnation. In other countries men have been spurred to progress (as also were the various species in the prehuman past of our race) by the constant shock of aggression and the unending struggle against powerful foes. But in China, with its fertile soil, its strong central government, and its protecting barriers of mountain and desert and sea, there was little to force man to

progress. At an early date the problem of the harnessing of men's instincts to the service of a great community had been largely solved ; and therefore we must acknowledge that for thousands of years (with certain intervals) the Chinese have lived a life which in many respects has been genuinely civilized and liberal. But the community which the Chinaman served, great as it was, and august and far-reaching, was not mankind itself. Progress was gradually stifled in isolation and self-sufficiency. The Chinese looked upon those who were not members of their own Celestial Empire as outer barbarians and foreign devils. Meanwhile their culture grew stale and obsolete, and their public life corrupt. Within the past two generations China has been rudely flung open to the world, and Chinese civilization challenged to expand so as to embrace in its scope of service all the world instead of one quarter only of mankind.¹ That challenge has produced strife and confusion, revolution, and agony ; but there is no reason to doubt that the Chinese spirit, whose peaceful industry and rigorous self-control have achieved so much in the past, will prove able to adapt itself to the new conditions, and to extend its loyal and patient service to all mankind.

The Significance of China for the World. Patient, industrious, and peaceful though the Chinese are, and eminently capable of loyalty to so great a community as is formed by their empire, their chief significance for mankind lies not in this, but

¹ The population of the Chinese Empire is about four hundred millions.




A Buddhist priest in China
saying his offices

in the example which they provide of the manner in which men may serve the future of their race.

Every Chinaman believes that a man owes it to God and to his ancestors, through whom he worships God, that he should be willing relentlessly to sacrifice himself for the sake of his family. This must not be taken to mean that a Chinaman serves *only* his own family; for in many ways he is a model citizen and patriot also. He is honest and trustworthy in his dealings. He observes no caste restrictions to sever him from his fellows. He is law-abiding and peaceful. He reverences and loves his great country. But still it is in his relationship to the future—to his little children and the unborn generations beyond them—that his capacity for free and willing service is most remarkably evident. He believes that it is his duty ruthlessly to deny himself leisure and comfort in order that he may rear a family. The converse of this attitude is shown in the respect and love with which he cares for the parents who gave to himself the chance to live and to hand on the gift of life. This strong family feeling has been hallowed and glorified by the religion of China, and especially by the teachings of the philosopher-sage Confucius, until it lies at the very heart of the Chinese attitude towards the world.

As a consequence China teems with human life. There are children everywhere. In spite of the richness of the soil and the extreme industry of the people, the population is so vast that poverty is rigorous and grinding. Large numbers live perpetually upon the edge of starvation; for the population crowds upon the means of life till a break in the rainfall starves millions. It is said that Chinese prisons have to be kept horrible in their conditions and barbarous in their punishments, because otherwise the poor would commit crime merely in order to get shut up in them and enjoy the prison fare. It is said also that in China a criminal condemned to death may find a substitute who, in consideration for a sum to be paid to his family, will cheerfully consent to be executed in place of the condemned man. Nothing could be more



CHINESE ARCHITECTURE, A Temple

typical of a people amongst whom the individual is glad to perish in order that his descendants may have the means of living.

An example. The Chinese trade-organizations give a clear illustration of the fashion in which the interests and instincts of men are subordinated to the needs of the future race.

'The vast Chinese industrial organizations consist chiefly, but not entirely, of unskilled labourers, and are not confined to men of any one trade. A bargain is struck between the workman and the agent of the association. Perhaps, in a remote village, a young workman agrees that his labour shall be farmed out by the association for so many years—generally six. He undertakes to go wherever the association sends him, and to undertake work of any description, and at any time. The association, on its part, contracts to lodge, to clothe, to feed him, and to maintain him in illness, or during unemployment, throughout six years. All this time he receives neither wages nor reward, but the association engages, on the expiry of that period, to take him back to his native village, and then and there to pay him a stipulated amount in a lump sum. Obviously the expenses of the association are considerable; obviously also the man, far from home and dependent on the association, cannot take the risk of incurring any suspicion of slackness, weakness, or any kind of inefficiency that might enable the association to repudiate its part of the bargain. The result is that he is spent and spends himself without mercy. It would not pay the association to engage him for a longer term; too often his health and strength are broken at the end of six years. But the scene changes when he is once more with his family and receives his little fortune. . . . He buys his wife; he becomes the father of a family.'¹

This may seem a grim picture of slavery; but it must be remembered that the Chinese labourer thus becomes a voluntary slave in order that he may obtain the means of life for his children. All this protracted toiling, and all the remorseless pressure of economic conditions which renders such toiling needful, are cheerfully endured in order that the future may have existence and that the race may not perish.

¹ Hubbard, *The Fate of Empires*, p. 158.



III

Christianity and Islam

The Jewish Religion. We have already paid brief notice to the settlement and growth in Palestine of the little Jewish people. We have seen that they were constantly harried by invasion, and from time to time carried off into exile. In the midst of these troubles two important developments took place. First, there arose amongst the Jews a series of great prophets proclaiming the holiness and majesty of a Universal God. Secondly, there developed in Palestine a new form of human association—the nation.

The God whom the Jews worshipped had at first been conceived of as the tribal deity of a nomadic people. But a period of exile in Egypt, and the teaching of the great prophet Moses, had brought home to the Jews the idea that this God of their race demanded from them, as his own people, righteousness. This righteousness meant obedience to a series of laws, the purport of which was that primitive instincts must be curbed, not only in the interests of individual and community and future generations, but because God himself demands from men purity, honesty, kindness, and other virtues. Thus righteousness came to signify in the minds of the Jews obedience to the will of a personal God as expressed in the Mosaic system of laws, by which such righteousness was enforced in a manner suited to the condition of a people still scarcely settled down after a wandering life.

For many centuries the Jews continued to conceive this God of righteousness as *their* God only, the God of the Jews helping his own 'peculiar people' (themselves) in their wars with surrounding tribes and empires. Their constant defeats

and disasters in those wars were put down to the anger of their God at their forgetting him and transgressing his law. In this manner there was deeply impressed on their minds the idea that sin is transgressing God's will, and inevitably involves punishment.

Later a succession of prophets, amongst whom the greatest was Isaiah, began to extend this narrow idea of a righteous national God into the broad and splendid idea of a righteous universal God, a God who loves and cares for all humanity, and expects all men to obey his law—to follow his will, by which alone the whole world can achieve righteousness and peace and happiness. But this idea that their own national God was also the God of all other men was never welcomed and adopted by the mass of the Jewish population. It remained a vision of the great and lonely souls of isolated prophets; and even the greatest of these retained a certain degree of narrowness—they could not shake off the idea that the Jews were in a position of special privilege towards God, though they recognized that this position entailed also special service of other peoples.

Jewish Nationalism. The precarious independence which the Jews had enjoyed was destroyed, and the people enslaved, first by the Assyrians (721 B. C.), then by the Chaldeans (586 B. C.), then by the Aryan Persians. Two hundred and fifty years later (333 B. C.) there followed the conquest of the Persian Empire (and with it of Palestine) by the Greeks led by the world-conqueror Alexander. For two and a half centuries the successors of Alexander held Palestine, their rule being at times exceedingly corrupt and oppressive.

Before and during this period there developed among the Jews a thing new in the earth—the conscious spirit of nationality. There appeared in Palestine a nation, a community of men regarding themselves as related by race and descent, speaking a language of their own, settled in a territory of their own, taught by tradition, history, and patriotic sentiment to regard themselves as possessed of a culture of their own and as



A vanquished people (perhaps the Jews) led away captive to Assyria

forming a separate community, distinct from all other communities. Nationality is a thing largely of feelings and sentiments which defy definition. Every clause indeed in the description given above can be shown to be untrue of one or more peoples which have reached and maintained distinct nationhood. But the reality of nationality is to-day perhaps the most momentous of all facts in the sphere of human relationships.

A nation differs from a tribe in being settled and possessed of culture. It differs from a caste or a class in inhabiting a territory of its own, whereas many castes or classes may coexist in the same territory. In most cases it differs from an empire, which may contain many nations, in being bound together by a common language, and in regarding its citizens as being related by race and descent. A nation is a group of men big enough to secure its separate existence and survival: and at the same time not too big to be bound together by the factors which we have just considered.

History has proved the enormous power of this new thing—nationhood—of which the Jews offered the first example. History has proved also that national feeling may mean a narrowing of loyalties which should be widened to embrace the whole world; and hence, as we shall see, nationalism may be of the gravest danger to mankind.

Jewish National Exclusiveness. As we look at the career of the Jews, we can see them gradually emerging from a tribal condition to that of nationhood, under the influence first of the strong religious bond which united them, and secondly of the disasters which befell them. Instead of weakening their spirit of union these disasters drew that union still closer; for, being interpreted as the signs of God's displeasure with his 'peculiar people', they served to rally all the best elements amongst the Jews to the cause of the regeneration and restoration of the national life. The prophets were far

more than mere religious teachers; many of them were political leaders also. Their message of obedience to God was often combined with a fierce intolerance of foreigners and of foreign religions. This intolerance was still more embittered by the sufferings which foreign peoples inflicted upon the Jews. Thus there grew up amongst them not only a strongly marked consciousness of their own separate nationhood, but also a hatred of all other peoples, and a proud exclusiveness based on the conviction that the religious and social institutions of the Jewish people were infinitely superior to those of all other peoples. The greatest of the prophets protested in vain against this overweening national pride. The Book of Jonah, in the Bible, forms a scathing condemnation of this characteristic Jewish attitude towards foreigners. Isaiah taught that the Jews must be proud not of their superiority to other peoples, but of the fact that they were specially called by God to humble service and self-sacrifice for foreign races. But such teaching went largely unheeded; and by the time of Christ the Jew was regarded by the Roman as 'the enemy of the human race'. In this respect Jewish history forms a grim warning of the dangers and the ultimate fate of a proud and exclusive nationalism.

Small and weak though it was, the Jewish nation, during the second century before Christ, made a gallant revolt against its Greek oppressors, and succeeded for a time in establishing its independence. However, it ultimately fell a victim to the advancing power of the strongly organized Roman Empire, by which it was crushed and exploited. The fierce spirit of the Jews led them, in A. D. 70, to rise in a desperate effort to regain their independence. The revolt was swiftly and mercilessly put down, and Jerusalem was destroyed. Thenceforward the Jews, being driven from their homeland, became more and more a scattered and persecuted community of traders. Yet for nearly two thousand years,

though they have been a nation without a country, they have succeeded in maintaining their national spirit. The main factor in this preservation of Jewish nationhood under unexampled hardships has been the ancient Jewish religion. In our own days there is a possibility that Palestine will once more become the national home of the Jews.

Christianity. Out of the ancient Jewish religion there sprang Christianity. In India Gautama Buddha was a member of the conquering Aryan race. In Palestine Jesus Christ was a member of a race which for centuries had been under the sway of Aryan conquerors (Persian, Greek, and Roman), but a race which had under that sway developed a high degree of national feeling, an intense pride in its past history and in its religious and social institutions, and an intolerant exclusiveness towards all other peoples. Under such conditions it might have been expected that the great teacher would have been a national leader—a popular hero who would have delivered his fellow-countrymen from the rule of their conquerors. This was indeed what many of the Jews themselves expected. On several occasions Christ was offered the opportunity of leading a rising against Rome ; but he steadily refused to meet the popular wishes, and it was in a measure the disgust of his fellow-countrymen at his failure in this respect which led to his betrayal to the Romans and to his death at their hands, by the barbarous method of crucifixion.

The Kingdom of God. Instead of becoming a national deliverer, Christ taught devotion to what he named the ' Kingdom of God '. The greatest prophets of his people had inculcated the idea of God as the universal Ruler of all mankind, demanding righteousness—obedience to his will—from all his creatures. To this great conception Christ added the teaching that God loves all men equally, whatever their race or class, however poor their condition, and however base and degraded their character. Christ himself passed his life



The earliest statue of CHRIST
(end of third or beginning of fourth century)

amidst poverty and hardship, and made it a practice to associate with those who were despised and shunned by their fellow-countrymen either as traitors to their country or as irreligious, disreputable, and dissolute. Christ chose such companionship, and avoided that of the religious and respectable, because—as he said—‘ Those that are well have no need of a doctor, but those that are sick ’. He knew that such outcasts were in most need of his help.

Christ taught that all the relationships of mankind must be regulated in accordance with this great fact that God loves all men, and loves them all equally. He therefore expounded—generally by means of graphic stories—the new order of human association which he called the Kingdom of God. In this Kingdom the whole of mankind were to live together in obedience to the will of their Heavenly Father, that is in love and freedom and mutual service, each subordinating his own desires and interests to the good of the whole. In other words, Christ taught what we have defined as the basis of true civilization. In pursuit of this ideal he spent himself in unremitting service of the poor and diseased, and for this ideal he laid down his life. Thus, by life and word, he laid the spiritual foundations of democracy and liberty and civilization. Christians have always believed that God himself was incarnate in Jesus Christ, that Christ rose again from the dead, and that on the cross at Jerusalem he died to save the world from sin, i. e. from the tyranny of that Desire which springs from instinct unrestrained and not directed to the service of humanity.

Christianity, in so far as it is moulded on the ideals of its Founder, stands for the widest extension of the principle of free and willing and self-sacrificing service. The Christian is spurred to such self-sacrifice by the thought, first, that God himself has in the past striven and suffered for humanity in Christ, and second, that Christ still lives and works in his servants for the uplifting of mankind.

The History of Christianity. The history of Christianity

has, from one point of view, been a long record of failure. It is true that, although the Christians were at first bitterly persecuted, Christianity had, within three centuries of the death of Christ, become the official religion of the huge Roman




Believed to be the earliest painting of CHRIST. A second-century fresco from a subterranean chamber in Rome

Empire, so that for a brief period it seemed—in spite of grievous faults in the Christian Church of that day—that Christ's ideal of a world-wide brotherhood in the Kingdom of God might be nearing realization. But then, as we shall see, there came a fresh flood of Aryan and Mongolian invaders, and the world was swamped once more in barbarism. When, more than a thousand years later, Europe began to struggle back to the degree of civilization she had once attained under

the Romans, she was fatally divided into hostile nationalities. Down to our own day these divisions have seemed to grow deeper and deeper, causing a succession of bloody wars. Christianity has appeared powerless to avert these wars or to draw the rival nations together. During the thousand years of barbarism the strongly organized Roman Church, with its traditions of unity inherited from the vanished Roman Empire, and its companies of learned monks, did invaluable service in preserving from destruction some relics of learning and culture, in gradually taming and teaching the barbarians, in enforcing at any rate superficial obedience to a supreme moral and religious authority, and in providing places of refuge amidst the universal disorder and violence, where the best men could quietly work for a better future. But during the past five hundred years the history of Christianity has been a melancholy record, not only of failure to reconcile warring nationalities, but of divisions in the ranks of the Christian Church itself, and, during the earlier part of this period, of religious wars and cruel persecutions. There have been countless individual Christians of spirit broad enough to transcend the barriers of nationality, of sect, and of race ; but as an organized whole the Church has been rent into scores and even hundreds of sectarian and national divisions, whilst its inability to check international injustice, rivalry, and conflict shows how grievously it has as yet fallen short of success in the fulfilment of its Founder's ideal, God's universal Kingdom of freedom and love.

Yet that ideal is to-day, perhaps more than ever before, living and working amongst men. In the uplifting of weak and degraded peoples, in the healing and care of the sick, in the spreading of education and of the ideals of equality and liberty, in the abolition of slavery and the raising of the status of the humbler classes of human society, above all in the constantly growing challenge to individual self-indulgence and wrongdoing shown in what is known as ' Public Opinion ', it



MODERN ARAB TYPES. The men's head-dress varies according to the tribe

can be seen that the Kingdom of God, for which Christ died, is making progress in many diverse directions, and is at work amongst men, spreading its ideals of freely given self-sacrificing service for mankind.

Moreover, as we shall see, there is at present more hope than there has been for many centuries that even amongst rival nations and races the ideals of the Kingdom of God shall come into effective operation.


The Arabs. The Jews are Semites¹—members of a distinct branch of the Southern Caucasian race, and originally nomads in Arabia, as also were the Assyrians and the Phoenicians before them. Many centuries after the inroads from the north which established Aryan empires in Persia and Greece and Rome, several centuries even after the beginnings of the later wave of Aryan and Mongolian invasion which destroyed the ancient forms of civilization, there came another great overflow of the Semitic nomads from Arabia.

These Arab invaders of the seventh century after Christ were inspired by strong tribal loyalty, and by far stronger loyalty to a new religion. This new religion was Islam. At the beginning of that century Islam had appeared in Arabia as a result of the life and teachings of the great prophet Muhammad. In the unity and enthusiasm inspired by this faith the Arab conquerors penetrated in a hundred years eastward and westward to India and Spain. They present one of the most extraordinary instances in history of the power of the wild dwellers amongst the steppes and deserts, when inspired by one strong purpose, to overthrow all institutions and empires, however ancient and well established, which may happen to come in their way.

Muhammad. Muhammad (A. D. 570–632) was a man filled with an intense conviction of the presence and power of the One Unseen God, the Creator and Ruler of all mankind. He

¹ The term Semite (Semitic) is, like the term 'Aryan', not strictly accurate when used to denote a race or group of races, as it belongs by rights to the sphere of language.

held all idolatry to be an abomination, as blasphemously degrading the high conception which men should hold of the spiritual glory of God. Their leader's compelling faith in the divine power and majesty welded the early Moslems¹ into



A PASSAGE FROM THE KORAN

From a manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Oxford

a militant fellowship, which swept away, like a straw before a torrent, the corrupt and decaying remains of Greek and Roman and Persian culture in the lands which they conquered. United in devotion to the one God, all Moslems were brothers. Muhammad had declared, 'Ye people! hearken to my speech and comprehend the same. Know that every

¹ *Moslem*, from the Arabic root 'salama', to submit: one who professes *Islam*, i. e. submission to the will of God.


Moslem is the brother of every other Moslem. All of you are on the same equality.' This principle has to a large extent remained dominant to this day, and to it Islam owes its survival.

The influence of Islam. Thus what Muhammad and his religion inculcated was and is the solid and practical spirit of brotherhood and equality which binds together all who believe in the Unseen and Omnipotent God. It is true that the brotherhood of Islam has at times been narrow in its spirit, intolerant of other faiths, and inclined to spread its own religion by force. But in the establishment of genuine brotherhood and equality within the ranks of the believers Moslems have achieved greater success than have Christians. The fellow-feeling of Moslems, from Morocco to China, whatever their race or colour, their language or nationality, is a great object-lesson to mankind in the possibility of a universal brotherhood based on spiritual ideals. If Islam has succeeded in transcending many of the obstacles to brotherhood and equality which have proved so fatal under other creeds, it must be possible for a still wider fellowship to be established which shall unite the whole of mankind.

The Conquests of the Arabs. Islam ran like a fire through the world. The beginning of the movement is generally reckoned at the 28th of June, A. D. 622, when Muhammad and one faithful friend, Abu Bakr, fled from Mecca, where they had been persecuted, to Medina, where they were received with enthusiasm. On the way they were pursued and nearly captured by their enemies. Abu Bakr cried, 'There be many that fight against us, and we are but two'. Muhammad replied, 'Not so; we are but two, but God is in the midst, a third'. At Medina the movement made rapid progress. The nomad tribes of Arabia were united, as if by magic, into a great and terrible power. When Muhammad died he was already master of a conquering empire, and was acknowledged as head and divinely inspired prophet of a simple,

priestless, and intensely God-fearing religion. From that day to this there has been little distinction between religion and politics in Islam. The head of the Faith (the Khalifa or 'Successor' of Muham-mad) has been also regarded as the head of the Moslem state or of the strongest Moslem state. The religious law of the Koran—the holy book, every letter of it held to be divinely inspired, which was revealed to Muham-mad—has formed, together with the body of its traditional interpretations, not only the guide to individual and social duty, but the everyday code of law and administration in Moslem countries. Thus in its strongest periods the brotherhood of Islam has been led to victory and empire by one single authority, supreme in matters both of religion, of government, and of military command. No wonder that a power thus united and thus centrally directed has frequently proved to be irresistible.

Two years after the death of Muhammad, under the great Khalifa Omar, the Arabs defeated the Greeks at the battle of the Yarmuk. Three years later they destroyed the




MOSLEM ART. A Lectern for the
Koran

Persian power at the three-days battle of Kadessia ; and by the middle of the seventh century they were masters of Egypt, Syria, Armenia, and Persia. Later, all north Africa was overrun, Spain was conquered, even France was invaded. Constantinople—then the chief seat of culture in the world, and capital of the Eastern Roman Empire—was twice nearly taken in the seventh century. Had it fallen Europe might conceivably have been conquered. Meanwhile eastward and north-eastward the conquering faith and power spread into India, and through Central Asia to the borders of China. By A. D. 715 the dominions of the Khalifa Walid extended from the Pyrenees to China, and it seemed as though the whole world would soon be Moslem.

However, a few years later the emperor of Constantinople decisively defeated the Moslems in a great struggle near his capital. And in 732 Charles Martel, leader of the Franks—Aryan invaders who had settled in France and adopted Christianity—defeated the Arabs at Tours and began the Christian counter-advance.


Meanwhile divisions were beginning to appear, as a natural result of the lack of good communications and the vast extent of the Moslem Empire. The outlying regions were becoming more or less independent. This tendency was increased by the setting in of a period of luxury and moral decay, which lasted for several centuries, although during this time a brilliant culture was developed at Bagdad under the Abbasid Khalifas. In the eleventh century the Arab Empire was finally swamped under the onslaught of the Seljuk Turks, who were wild Mongolian nomads from Central Asia and beyond. Later these Seljuks were followed by the kindred tribe of Ottoman Turks. Long before this the Turks had adopted Islam ; and from the time of their first conquest of Bagdad they have remained the most powerful champions of the religion of Muhammad.

The Crusades. The Arabs had treated the Christian pilgrims



Street Scene in Old Bagdad

to Jerusalem with tolerance, and had encouraged trade between Europe and the East. But the fierce Seljuks ill-treated the pilgrims, plundered the traders, and threatened once more to conquer the Greek empire of Constantinople. The result of this was a great combination of the Christians of Europe, mostly Aryans, against the Mongolian and Semitic



RHODES, St. Nicholas's Fort. Once used as a lighthouse by the
Knights of St. John

Moslems. A series of wars took place, called the Crusades, which are of great importance in the development of European civilization. The fierce nobles and almost savage peasantry of north-western Europe came into contact with the far more cultured peoples of the South. The Continent was united for a time in one great purpose, to sweep back the Moslem invader, and recapture the site of the Holy Sepulchre. The influence of the Roman Church, at whose call the Crusaders were gathered, was very greatly increased.

The Crusades lasted, with intervals, for nearly two hundred years. In many respects they resembled the old migrations of the nomads. The infection of the nomadic spirit spread indeed so widely amongst all classes and ages, that there were a People's Crusade and a Children's Crusade, both of which ended in ghastly tragedy. The Crusaders failed in their main purpose, chiefly on account of the determined resistance offered to their attacks by the great Moslem emperor Saladin (Sala-ud-din), who united the Moslems of all races against the invaders, and recaptured Jerusalem from them (A. D. 1187).



Seal of a Preceptor of Knights Templars in Yorkshire.
The Cross above the Crescent. Date 1303

In the fifteenth century came another great westward movement of the Moslems. In 1453 Constantinople was at last captured, and the Turkish invaders spread all over south-eastern Europe. Early in the sixteenth and late in the seventeenth century they even attacked Vienna, the southern outpost of Germany. Disunion amongst the rival European nationalities made it appear probable that the Moslems would overrun the whole continent; but luxury and moral decay once more set in to relieve the pressure, and the tide of Turkish conquest rolled back again, until in our own day the Turks


hold in Europe only Constantinople and the eastern portion of Thrace.

The Arab Culture. For more than six centuries Moslems of various races held the paramount power in India, where, as we have seen, the magnificent Mogul Empire, established by Mongolian Moslems, gave to the world one of the most perfect types of architecture it possesses. But the culture of Islam attained its zenith in the earlier times of the Arabs.

In philosophy, in history, in mathematics, in science, in poetry, and above all in medicine, the world owes an immense debt to the Arabs. At a time when Europe was lying in the darkness of barbarism, forgetful of her ancient culture and civilization, the influence and teaching of the Arabs was of the greatest importance in maintaining liberal studies and finally in bringing about the revival of European learning. There were great Arab universities at Basra, Kufa, Bagdad, Cairo, and Cordova. At Cordova, which is in Spain, there were many Christian students from northern Europe, who went back as teachers to their own countries.


Amongst many famous Arab scholars and men of science, perhaps the most noteworthy are Avicenna (Ibn Sina, 980-1037) of Bokhara in Turkestan, in whom the Arabian medical science reached its highest point, and Averroes (Ibn Rushd, 1126-98) of Cordova, who was the greatest of Arab philosophers, and had much influence in bringing back to Europe the ideals of accurate thought which the Greeks had first proclaimed.

The Arab scholars carried to the West various valuable elements of knowledge which they derived from Indian sources, above all algebra and the Arabic numerals. The last named were an invaluable boon, for up to that time mathematics had been hopelessly handicapped by the use of the clumsy Roman numerals. The Arabs also manufactured paper, and thus prepared the way for printing and the wide spreading of education.



Alhambra, the Court of the Lions

In our own time Islam is spreading rapidly in Africa. Wherever it goes it carries with it its great belief in the brotherhood of all believers. Strong in its allegiance to the One God, it transcends the barriers of race and caste and nationality, which elsewhere have so fatally divided mankind. This is its greatest contribution to the world.



THE MOSQUE IN CONSTANTINOPLE, which was once Sancta Sophia,
the first Church of Christian Byzantium (sixth century)



IV


Greece

The Aryan Invaders of Greece. We must now return a very long way, to the dim days when the Aryans were first advancing southward and westward. Perhaps about fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ these Aryans began to enter northern Greece. The invading tribes called themselves Hellenes, and spoke different varieties of one language. They were fair in complexion, and like other Aryans they burned their dead. Some hundreds of years later the Hellenes destroyed the great Minoan Empire of Crete and the Aegean Sea, with its highly developed culture and its sea-borne commerce.¹ They themselves rapidly became expert sailors. They developed a passion for overseas colonization, and began to establish settlements in all the islands of the Aegean and around its coasts. Next they pushed north-eastward into the Black Sea (where they founded colonies as far away as the Crimea), westward to Italy and Sicily, and north-westward to Marseilles in France. Thus the shores of the Mediterranean became scattered over with Hellenic, that is Greek, colonies. Later than the first wave of Hellenic invasion there came a second, that of the Macedonians, who settled in the northern districts of Greece, and the Phrygians, who passed over into Asia Minor.

The Homeric Greeks. The great poem called the Iliad gives us a vivid picture of early Aryan life. It is ascribed to a blind poet named Homer, and was composed at a time when the Hellenic invaders had but recently settled in Greece and taken

¹ See p. 42.

to the sea. It describes a war between the tribes of the first wave of invasion and the Phrygians of the second wave, some of whom had established a strong city, Troy—for purposes of trade or brigandage, or both—at a point where the land route from east to west, passing from Asia into Europe, crosses the sea-route from south to north between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. In the sister-poem to the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, we probably have tales handed down from the times



TROY

Nunc seges est ubi Troia fuit (Ovid). 'Troy town is covered up with weeds . . . Where Priam's ancient palace stood' (Masefield)

when the Greeks were making their first voyages of exploration into the Black Sea.

In these great epic poems we see the early Aryan organization of society. There were three classes—the nobles, the common people, and the slaves. There was no true priestly class corresponding to the Brahmans in India.¹ The King was the chief noble, depending upon the approval of his companions—the

¹ No genuine priestly class was ever developed in Greece. The kings and nobles kept largely in their own hands the religious duties elsewhere performed by such a class. The same is true of Rome.

rest of the nobility—for his right to succeed to the kingship, asking them for guidance and counsel in any crisis, and liable to be deposed by them if he misbehaved. The King was chief judge and chief priest in virtue of his office. The common people met in general assembly to hear the decisions made by the King in consultation with the nobles. Though in this assembly the people could only express their approval or disapproval on the points laid before them, their opinion had great weight, for they formed the mass of the fighting men. Beneath the nobles and the common people were the slaves—captives taken in war and their descendants. These slaves probably belonged for the most part to the Southern Caucasian race which had built up the conquered Minoan Empire. We can trace a parallel between the Greek nobles and the Indian Kshatriyas, the Greek common people and the Indian Vaisyas, the Greek slave-class and the Indian Sudras.

The City-State. At first the rude Aryan invaders of Greece lived in open villages, each comprising a number of families ; but it was not long before the new-comers began to follow the example of their Minoan predecessors, and to build cities. These cities became the nurseries of the Greek civilization, which in some respects was in advance of any type of civilization now existing in the world.


The Greek cities were little places. By far the greatest and most famous of them was Athens, the chief centre of one of the races or divisions of the Hellenes, the Ionian Greeks ; but Athens herself at the height of her power and the zenith of her civilization cannot have had a population of more than two hundred and fifty thousand, of whom at least half must have been slaves. Other Greek cities were far smaller. They were extremely jealous of their independence, and often at war with each other. When they united at some time of crisis into leagues or alliances, such unions were generally insecure and short-lived. This spirit of division, which finally led to the overthrow of Greek independence, was largely due to the fact that Greece is a country split up into many small

and distinct regions, which are divided from each other by high mountain-ranges or by broad inlets of the sea, so that communication is difficult.

In spite of the divisions and conflicts thus caused it was a most fortunate thing for mankind that a people with the splendid mental powers of the Greeks happened to settle in a land where the natural line of development led towards the growth of small, independent city-states. For in such surroundings true civilization—the spirit of freedom and service—is most readily born and nurtured, though for its full development a wider sphere becomes later on essential. In a city-state the people are compelled, for mutual defence, for trade, and for other purposes, to combine and work together actively for the good of the whole community. Yet the individual is not unduly subordinated, as tends to happen in larger states ; and thus true freedom, combined with the ideal of service, has a chance to take root and flourish in a way that may later set an example to the whole world, and so help to build up far and wide a higher civilization.

On the vast plains of India Aryan city-states had probably developed at an early date, and had perhaps reached an advanced stage of freedom and civilization ; but their exposed position rendered them liable to destruction in war, or to early embodiment in big empires, in which the necessity for a strong central control made it hard to develop a spirit of freedom and service in the individual.

The citizens of the Greek city-state all looked back to one common ancestor and founder. They regarded each other as kindred. They were intensely proud of their city's beauties, her temples and fine buildings, her institutions, her freedom, her ancient heroes, her protecting gods and goddesses, her famous achievements in the past. They laid down their lives gladly for their city in battle. For her sake they lived and worked, and brought up their families. Thus all a Greek's instincts and activities were directed with eager loyalty to the service of his city. He served her with his whole soul.



THE OLIVE-GROVES OF GREECE. Behind, Aegosthena, a ruined fortress of the fourth century B. C.

In the case of Athens and other democratically governed cities, he served her in freedom—in a measure of freedom greatly exceeding in many directions that attained under the most liberal of modern constitutions.¹ Thus the Greek city-state, small as it was, and narrow as its interests often appear, was yet a nursery of true civilization, and an example to the world of how such civilization may be developed and perfected by means of practical institutions and well-devised laws.

The Government of the City-State. The old monarchies mostly disappeared as the city-states developed. The nobles became too strong for the kings, and either suddenly or by a gradual process took the government into their own hands. Thus nearly all the cities passed through a stage of aristocratic rule, under which nobles alone could hold office in the state. But the nobles used their power selfishly. They were overproud of their birth and wealth and position. They grew lazy and luxurious. They oppressed the poorer citizens with harsh laws, and especially with cruel burdens of debt.

‘The poorer classes, men, women, and children, were in absolute slavery to the rich. . . . They cultivated the lands of the rich for a sixth part of the produce. The whole country was in the hands of a few persons, and if the tenants failed to pay their rent, they were liable to be dragged off into slavery and their children with them. Their persons were mortgaged to their creditors. . . . But the hardest and bitterest part of the condition of the masses was the fact that they had no share in the offices then existing under the constitution. . . . To speak generally, they had no part or share in anything.’²

Thus in time there took place in most Greek cities another change of government. Either violently, or by a process of legislation, the aristocratic families, which in many cases had

¹ It must be borne in mind, however, that only a small proportion of the inhabitants of Athens were ‘citizens’ with political rights. The rest were women, foreigners, slaves, &c.

² Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens*, chapter v.


already been seriously weakened by luxury, were deprived of their power. Sometimes, profiting by the popular discontent, a single man arose, and by the help of the common people, or sometimes of a class of rich men who were not nobles, overthrew the aristocracy, and having done so ruled in its place himself. Such single rulers were called tyrants. Their courts were often magnificent ; and they were patrons of art and poetry and science, so that European culture owes much to the Greek tyrants. But their rule was despotic and selfish. They generally endeavoured to conquer other states and to found big empires ; and by such aggression they displeased the Greek mind, with its passionate love for the independent city-state. Thus in most Greek states the popular discontent sooner or later brought about another change. The common people rose up, and took the power into its own hands, thus establishing democracy.

Athenian Democracy. In Greece democracy, the government of the people by the people itself, was ' direct '. That is to say, the citizens did not elect representatives to the popular assembly, as in modern democracies, but every citizen ¹ had the right of himself attending and participating in the work of that assembly, and thus of helping to make the laws, to choose the magistrates and officials, and to settle foreign relationships. At Athens every citizen was also eligible for membership of the executive council of the state, and for all the chief positions in civil and military command. The citizens were even paid for their attendance at the Athenian assembly and in the Law Courts, where they sat as judges. The result of this was that, at Athens and elsewhere, direct democracy tended after a time to decline into government by the idle and poverty-stricken elements among the citizens, who had no work to do, and who desired the easily earned pay of a member of the Assembly or Council, or of a judge in the Law Courts. But this was a later degenera-


See note on p. 98.

tion. For the century and a half during which Athenian democracy was strong and glorious, the performance of public business in the Assembly and the holding of public office were regarded by the best men in the state as the highest of honours. During this period Athens produced a marvellous wealth of genius. In the drama, in sculpture, in architecture, in philosophy, in history, in oratory, in statesmanship, that age still shines like a beacon, guiding mankind along the rough path towards the highest and fullest civilization. Athens solved for a time the problem of giving the right training and opportunity to each individual citizen, so that on every side his nature might be rightly developed for the fullest and freest service of the state. Every citizen was equal before the law, took equal responsibility in the tasks of government, could be present at the numerous and splendid festivals and dramatic performances, for which free tickets were given to the poorer citizens, and which served as a broad and liberal education to the whole community. Moreover, not only did every Athenian have the opportunity, at some time or other in his life, of taking part in public business and holding public office, but the spirit and institutions of his city continually spurred him on to develop fully the best that was in him, in order that he might fitly serve Athens. This tradition of responsibility and progress and self-development for the good of the community was combined, in the time of Athens' highest glory, with a thing the Greeks admired exceedingly—a spirit of sanity and reasonableness and good sense, which forbade the oppression or exploitation of one class by another, and checked the bitterness of party feeling. In the words of Pericles, the great statesman who guided Athens through the thirty years of her supreme greatness :

‘It is true that we are called a democracy, for the administration is in the hands of the many and not of the few. But while the law secures equal justice to all alike in their private



A GREEK THEATRE. Ruins at Epidaurus said once to have seated more than 20,000 spectators



THE ERECHTHEUM on the Athenian Acropolis, in which were preserved the salt spring of Poseidon and the olive-tree given by Athene

disputes, the claim of excellence is also recognized; and where a citizen is in any way distinguished, he is appointed to the public service, not as a matter of privilege, but as a reward of merit. Neither is poverty a bar, but a man may benefit his country, whatever be the obscurity of his condition. There is no exclusiveness in our public life; . . . a spirit of reverence pervades our public acts; we are prevented from doing wrong by respect for authority and for the laws, having a special regard for those which are ordained for the protection of the injured, as well as for those unwritten laws which bring upon the transgressor of them the reprobation of the general sentiment.' ¹

The Laws. These noble words bring us to another matter in which Greek influence on the development of civilization has been of the highest importance. The Athenian had a deep reverence for the laws of his city, regarding them as the almost sacred guardians not only of the commonwealth as a whole, but also of his own private liberty and well-being.

The first code of written law at Athens was produced by the aristocrat Draco, in the seventh century before Christ. This code is reputed to have been harsh and severe, but its details have not come down to us. Early in the sixth century a second and far more important code was devised by the great legislator Solon. The crushing burden of debt under which the poorer classes had long groaned was lifted from their shoulders; and wise economic and social reforms were made in order to ensure that the burden should never be reimposed. Again, a great step was made towards a more democratic system of government; wealth and not birth was made the test of eligibility for office; and, what was more important, all citizens were made members of an assembly to which officials had to answer for their conduct when their year of office was over, and to which certain other important matters were submitted for decision.

Late in the sixth century there came a third great develop-

¹ Thucydides, ii. 37: Jowett's translation.



GREEK ART. A statue of the Goddess of Health, fourth cent. B.C.
(Sir Alfred Mond's collection)

ment in the Athenian constitution—the Laws of Cleisthenes. This code established the complete and direct system of democracy which has already been outlined (p. 99), and ensured that there should remain in Athens no privileged caste or class, no bureaucracy, no band of professional politicians, but that all men should be equally masters and servants of the state. Under this system, with its carefully worked-out rules for the right conduct of a truly democratic government, Athens reached her highest pinnacle of freedom and greatness. Thus it is not surprising that the Athenian was filled with reverence for the constitution to which he owed so much, and was ‘prevented from doing wrong by respect for authority and for the laws’. Elaborate safeguards were provided to prevent unconstitutional procedure in the conduct of public business or in the work of administration; and his constant personal experience of the work of law-making and law-administering made the average Athenian a keen-sighted and watchful guardian over the sanctity of his beloved constitution.

Thus came into the world the idea of constitutional law. Men learnt at Athens to regard Law not as the decree of a monarch, nor as the command of an aristocrat or an official, nor as the enactment of some great and almost legendary Lawgiver, but as the expression of the corporate will of the whole community, ensuring that the life of that community should be preserved inviolate in its freedom and equality. The Law was revered at Athens because it safeguarded the liberty both of the individual and of the state, and gave to each man and to the city as a whole the opportunity for a full and enlightened life.

The Persian Invasions. To the east of Greece and the Grecian seas there stretched away—in the reign of Darius I (521–496 B. C.) as far as the river Indus—the great empire of Persia. It was governed by Aryans distantly akin to the Greeks themselves; but its vast bulk, its despotic form of

government, and the low stage of civilization to which it had attained, made it and its institutions utterly alien to the Greek spirit. In a series of great invasions the power of Persia, relying on numerous armies and immense fleets, moved westward upon Greece. Small and poor and divided as she was, Greece seemed to be destined to entire destruction. The Persian advance was like one more of those irresistible migrations which we have already noticed.

First the Lydian kingdom, a non-Aryan community, whose capital was Sardis, and which stood as a bulwark between Greece and Persia, was overthrown and destroyed. Then the Greeks in Asia Minor were subdued, in spite of the determined resistance offered by the great city of Miletus. Finally, in 490 B. C., in the reign of Darius, the Persian host embarked in six hundred ships and sailed for Greece itself.




Coin of Darius showing the Great King passing through his dominions with bow and spear

The chief Greek cities, Athens and Sparta, had already been summoned by Persian heralds to submit, and had answered by putting the heralds to death. Bent on a bloody revenge for this insult the Persians landed at Marathon, a place on the coast twenty miles from Athens, where they found themselves faced by a little force of nine thousand Athenians. In the great and memorable battle which followed the immense Persian host was utterly defeated by the discipline and valour of the Greeks. The effect of the victory was immense. Free democracy in a small city-state had come into conflict with a despot-governed world-empire, and had been completely victorious. It had vindicated the principle that, as the citizen should be free to serve the state in his own way, so the whole state should be free from foreign domination. The claim to Autonomy, that is of

self-government as opposed to imperialism,¹ had been triumphantly asserted.

Ten years later, in the reign of Xerxes, the Persians came again, and this time by land as well as by sea. An immense army crossed the Dardanelles. 'There were negroes from upper Egypt, clad in lion-skins and war-paint, and armed with bows, darts, and clubs; Assyrians in full armour; Indian archers clothed in cotton; Libyans in leather, with




THE DARDANELLES. The Vessel is a relic of the Great War

stakes hardened in the fire as their only weapon; light-armed Thracians with fawn-skin boots and fox-skins on their heads; Scythians bearing battle-axes; men from Baluchistan whose helmets were the skins of horses' heads with flowing manes. Forty-five nations placed under Persian generals contributed infantry. Besides them were a host of cavalry eighty thousand strong, a camel corps, and chariots.'² The total number of infantry alone was said to be two millions, though probably the Greek greatly exaggerated the number


¹ Imperialism may be briefly defined as the rule of many states by one for its own advantage and glory.

² Edmonds, *Greek History*, p. 116.



MARATHON

'The Battle-field, where Persia's victim horde
First bow'd beneath the brunt of Hellas' sword' (Byron)



THERMOPYLAE

'Where Oeta's ridge of granite bars
The gate Thermopylae' (Rennell Rodd)

of his enemies. In support of this horde of invaders was a navy of twelve hundred great ships, each with over two hundred men on board, and three thousand smaller ships.


The Greeks met this vast and motley array with seven thousand men, who stationed themselves at the narrow pass of Thermopylae, between the sea and the mountains, at the entrance to Greece proper. Here was fought another ever-famous battle, in which Leonidas and his little force held the Persians at bay for nearly a week whilst the resistance of Greece was being organized behind them. Even when the Persians found a way round behind the pass, three hundred Spartans, with some allies, refused to retire, and died fighting to the last man, earning thereby immortal fame. Their sacrifice had not been in vain. The Persians indeed advanced farther into Greece; but their spirit was broken, whilst the forces of the Greeks had been mobilized, and their spirit raised high by the heroic example of the Spartan three hundred. The Persian fleet was met and defeated by the Greeks, chiefly Athenians, at Salamis, under the very eyes of Xerxes. It was the first great naval battle of the world, and was won by superiority in discipline and seamanship. Athens herself had already been burnt; but the Persians were forced to retire, and their army was finally destroyed at Plataea.

Thenceforward there was no further danger of a Persian invasion of Greece. The free Greek states, tiny and poor and divided as they were, had shaken themselves loose from the grip of the vast tyrant-empire, with its colossal resources and its innumerable armies, and in so doing had established the ideal of Autonomy in face of foreign imperialism.

Socrates. Perhaps the greatest man ever born at Athens, the greatest city of Greece, the country whose civilization was in some ways the greatest that the world has ever seen, was a poor and ugly sculptor called Socrates (469-399 B. C.). Like nearly all his fellow citizens he took his turn in the holding of public office, and showed therein remarkable

strength and independence of character. He also fought bravely for Athens as one of her citizen-soldiers. Apart from this he devoted his life to the search for genuine truth and righteousness, and made many enemies by his outspoken criticisms of current opinions and of popular heroes. He also trained a group of disciples, of whom by far the most noteworthy was the great philosopher Plato. Master and pupil between them may be said to have been the first to teach mankind how to think in a clear and disciplined manner.

But Socrates' claim to supreme greatness rests chiefly on the manner of his death. Some of his enemies prosecuted him for teaching immoral and unorthodox opinions. He was manifestly innocent, and might have escaped by any one of a dozen somewhat underhand methods which were common enough at the time; for example, by flattering his judges, or bribing his jailor. However, in accordance with his conception of honourable and public-spirited conduct, he absolutely refused to do any such thing. At his trial he simply maintained his innocence, his right to declare and teach what he held to be the truth, and the necessity of obeying the voice of God rather than the commands of men—even the commands of the citizen-legislators of his own beloved Athens. In the simple and dignified Defence which he delivered before the five hundred and one Athenian judges, he declared :



SOCRATES. From a
Hellenistic gem

‘ If you think that a man of any worth at all ought to reckon the chances of life and death when he acts, or that he ought to think of anything but whether he is acting rightly or wrongly, and as a good or a bad man would act, you are

grievously mistaken. . . . Athenians, I hold you in the highest regard and love : but I will obey God rather than you : and as long as I have breath and strength I will not cease from the search for truth, and from exhorting you, and declaring the truth to every one of you whom I meet, saying as I am wont, " My excellent friend, you are a citizen of Athens, a city which is very great and very famous for wisdom and power of mind ; are you not ashamed of caring so much for the making of money, and for reputation and for honour ? Will you not think or care about wisdom, and truth, and the perfection of your soul ? " . . . There is no man who could make me consent to do wrong from the fear of death ; but I would perish at once rather than give way.'

When he was condemned to death, Socrates declared : ' No evil can happen to a good man either in life or after death.' ¹

Liberty of Conscience. In this spirit Socrates met his death at the hands of the Athenians—for the highest greatness of Athens was already past. He thus set to the world an example even more valuable than those which his country offers. Socrates died for freedom of thought and speech and action, the right of every man to think and say and do what his conscience tells him is in accord with truth and duty. He died, that is, for liberty of conscience, and he based the right for which he died on the only sure foundation—the duty of every man to obey the voice of God in his own heart. Without this deeper freedom every other form of freedom, even democracy and equality before the law and state-independence, is but an empty show, and must result in the blind and cruel tyranny of an unenlightened majority over the few who should be leaders and prophets directing their fellows towards a new and better age of human progress and achievement.

The Failure of Greece. One fatal weakness of Athens has already been noticed. Her direct democracy might make for government by a lazy and pauperized mob. Another source

¹ Church's translation of Plato's *Defence of Socrates*.

of weakness was the fact that her culture and civilization were based on slavery ; for the leisure and freedom of the Athenian citizen were bought at the cost of the toil and subjection of his slaves. Moreover, Athens soon fell to a temptation which has beset almost every people of the earth when once it has attained its own liberty, namely, the desire to impose its will upon other peoples and to restrict their freedom. An Athenian empire was built up, under which many other Greek states were taxed and exploited in order that beautiful buildings and pageants might glorify Athens, and that Athenian citizens might receive free tickets to the great dramatic performances, fees for attending the Assembly and the Law Courts, and even free food. The result was the development of an Athenian imperialism involving the denial of liberty to its subject-states, just as the Persian imperialism had done. This led to a widespread hatred of Athens, and finally to her defeat in a prolonged war, of which we have a magnificent record in the pages of the great historian Thucydides.

Again, the Greek city-states, divided from each other by such bitter jealousies, were so totally unable to combine into anything resembling a strongly knit and centrally-controlled federation, and were torn by such fierce internal disputes between various factions and parties, that nothing could save them from conquest one by one as soon as a power sufficiently near and strong and well organized arose to effect that conquest.

Alexander. So it came about that, in 338 B. C., at the battle of Chaeronea, the rising imperial power of Macedonia, under King Philip, finally swamped the free Greek states. Demosthenes, the great orator, and 'the last and in some respects the most heroic champion of the Greek instinct for autonomy', had warned his fellow citizens in vain against the fate which awaited them, and had striven fruitlessly to unite the Greeks in an organized resistance.


There followed the brilliant meteor career of Alexander

the Macedonian, who utterly destroyed the vast Persian Empire, penetrating beyond its farthest limits into India, and creating a Greek Empire in its place. Had Alexander lived ten years more, he might have devised a system of law and government, modelled on Greek ideals of free civilization and adequate for the administration of a great world-empire. As it was, he established colonies of Greeks far and wide through Asia. These colonies became centres of commerce and of Greek culture. Above all he left behind him, deeply implanted in men's minds, the idea of universal dominion—of a world-state. The world-state of Alexander would not have been a selfish and tyrannous imperialism. His treatment of the cities of Greece, which were left in all but absolute independence, shows that he had in him the capacity to combine central control with the greatest possible degree of Home Rule for the states and peoples making up his empire. Thus his early death in 323 B. C., at the age of thirty-two, and the consequent breaking up of his vast dominions, was a great tragedy for the world.


Perhaps the most enduring part of Alexander's work was the foundation of the great city of Alexandria, which for a thousand years remained a nursery and university of Greek learning and culture, and a great laboratory and workshop of science and invention.

Greek Science. Plato (429–347 B. C.), the famous pupil of Socrates, was not only a great thinker, but also a great prophet. He devised a new scheme of life for mankind, an ideal state or Utopia, ruled and organized in accordance with true wisdom and justice; and though this ideal Republic of Plato was bounded by the narrow limits of the Greek city-state, it has had a profound effect upon the thought of mankind ever since.


Plato, again, had a pupil almost as great as himself, Aristotle (384–322 B. C.), who in his turn was the tutor of Alexander. Aristotle set himself laboriously to gather and examine and



ALEXANDER THE GREAT




Alexander's route to the East. The plain of the Oxus, showing British troops crossing during the Great War



The walls of Merv, one of Alexander's foundations in central Asia

compare innumerable facts and details, from the study of which he discovered some of the great general laws governing both nature and human life. He was perhaps the first true scientist. His method of inquiry was adopted by the investigators and students of the great university of Alexandria, who made astonishing progress in their researches in many directions, and may be said to have laid broad and strong




An early use of steam-power by Heron of Alexandria. ? first cent. B. C.


the foundations of modern science. In mathematics the greatest amongst these Alexandrian scholars was Euclid, the founder of geometry. Another great mathematician, Eratosthenes, measured the diameter of the earth, and came within fifty miles of the true figure. At Alexandria also Heron devised the first steam-engine, and Archimedes made researches which afterwards enabled him to invent the lever and the screw, and to become the world's first

great mechanical engineer. In medicine also the Alexandrians made immense advances. For instance, they started the practice of scientific dissection as a method of learning the actual nature and structure of the human body. In the great Library of their university were collected vast numbers of books ; but these were still written by hand, with long and tedious labour, and great risk of error.

Thus the Greeks of Athens and Alexandria brought into the world the scientific spirit—the endeavour, made by means of experiment and observation and collection of details,



PLATO. A copy of an original of the fourth cent. B.C.
Holkham Hall, Norfolk.



ARISTOTLE. From the head in the Hofmuseum,
Vienna. (Mansell).

accurately to understand the world and all within it, and to learn the real causes of everything that happens.

The Influence of Greece on the World. In many other ways the Greeks influenced the history of the world, especially in the domain of art and thought. In the architecture of the Parthenon, the great temple on the Acropolis at Athens, in the sculptures of Pheidias, notably the frieze of the Parthenon now in the British Museum, in the dramas of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, in the lyric poetry of Pindar, to take some of the most famous examples, Greece established standards of beauty in the various arts such as the world had not known before and has perhaps never surpassed. Nor should it be forgotten that she gave us Herodotus and Thucydides, the former the father of history, the latter the creator of philosophical history. It has been said that everything in the modern world that really moves onward in progress is Greek in origin. They were a little people, and their greatness was short lived ; but mankind must for ever reverence in them the consummate genius which gave to the world the ideals of Democracy, of constitutional Law, of Autonomy, of Liberty of Conscience—the genius also which first taught us how Science may gain for man the control of the world in which he lives, and how a World-State may come into being, in which all nations shall unite, each retaining the highest degree of independence.

The great peoples of the East had discovered for humanity the spiritual basis of civilization, the conquest of desire, brotherhood, service, equality, and the Kingdom of God. The invaluable contribution of Greece was the discovery of practical means—institutions, methods of government, definite rights to be claimed and enforced—whereby a civilization based on spiritual ideals may some day be established in permanent working reality throughout the earth.



V

R o m e

The Origin of the Romans. About the same time that the Aryan Hellenes entered Greece kindred Aryan tribes invaded Italy. There they came into conflict with a branch of the Southern Caucasian race, the Etruscans, who possessed a culture somewhat similar to the Minoan culture, and had probably originally reached Italy by sea from the east.¹ The Aryan invaders of Italy did not at once conquer the Etruscans, as the Hellenes had conquered the Minoans. Indeed for a long period the Etruscans probably ruled the Aryans. One of the Aryan tribal communities was settled south of the Etruscan country in central Italy, and north of the Greek colonies in the southern part of the peninsula. They were a rough farming people grouped in twelve townships round a central temple on a sacred mountain. They were called the Latins. The frontier between their country and that of the Etruscans was the river Tiber, at one point on which there was a ford with some steep hills near it, of no great height, but suitable for defence. Here sprang up a group of Latin settlements, at first inhabited by traders and refugees. These settlements were later combined into the city of Rome.

The Kings. In her early days Rome was governed by Kings, or rather chieftains, similar to those who ruled over other primitive Aryan peoples. The King of Rome had great power both in peace and war, which power the Romans, who

¹ It is, however, possible that the Etruscans were Aryans also.

had a genius for legal definition, called his 'imperium'. He was also chief priest and chief judge. He was expected, however, to ask and take advice from the nobles, who formed a body called the Senate. If he misbehaved, and especially if he misused his power of life and death over the citizens, the nobles resisted him. Below the nobles there were the common people, who, according to legend, were organized for military and financial purposes by a great King named Servius, who also fortified Rome. Being thus organized, and beginning to feel their power, the common people began to demand a larger share in the government. After the death of Servius there came, in all probability, an Etruscan conquest of Rome and tyrannical misrule on the part of Etruscan Kings.

The Consuls. At the end of the sixth century before Christ the nobles rose against this foreign despotism, and after a hard struggle succeeded in winning their city's independence. The kingship was abolished; but the supreme power, the 'imperium', which the kings had enjoyed, was retained; for the Romans were always a very conservative people. The imperium was, however, divided, in order to prevent its misuse in the future. The King's military command was given to two new magistrates called 'consuls': his priestly functions to an official called the King of the Sacrifices: and, later on, his judicial powers to 'praetors'. Of these officers of state the consuls were by far the most important. They held office only for a year. They were appointed by the Assembly of the whole people, so that a long step had already been taken towards democracy. They were also responsible to the Assembly when their term of office was over.

At first the consuls were always nobles, and their position and restricted powers made them always dependent upon the advice of the council of nobles, the Senate, which thus soon became supreme in the government of Rome.




'Steep hills . . . suitable for defence,' An Italian hill town

The Commons gain Power. Then came a long struggle between the nobles and the common people—a struggle which was embittered, as at Athens, by the fact that many commoners were hopelessly in debt to noble money-lenders. On several occasions the people, failing to obtain in any other way the rights which they desired, left Rome in a body with the intention of founding a new city of their own. By this means the Senate was always brought to reason: debts were cancelled, and new laws made, so that the common people gradually and without bloodshed came into possession of a full share of power in the government.

Early in the fifth century the commons obtained Tribunes, officers elected by themselves and from their own number, whose function it was to protect them from oppression at the hands of the nobles. These Tribunes were eventually given the wide power of imposing their veto upon any law and any act of a magistrate which threatened the security of the commons. Later on, the commons demanded and obtained the codification and publication of the laws, the equality of every citizen before the law, the right of intermarriage between commons and nobles (this marks the end at Rome of the danger of caste), the sovereign power in legislation, and finally (by the great Licinian laws, 367 B. C.) the control of the executive power by the provision that one consul must—and both consuls might—be commoners. These Licinian laws also instituted precautions against indebtedness and against the piling-up of too much wealth in the hands of a class of rich men.

The result of the struggle between nobles and commons was to establish the great principle of the sacredness of a free man's person and property, whatever his class and standing. This principle was embodied in definite laws controlling the administration of justice between man and man. The Roman conception of law in this respect must be distinguished from the idea of an established constitution, assigning the powers



The beauty of the Italian coast. Vesuvius and Naples from ' Virgil's Tomb'

of the state to particular categories of citizens, which the world owes to Greece. Rome's contribution to the life of mankind in this respect is little if any less valuable than that of Greece, for the most admirable regulation of the relationships between the state and its individual citizens will be useless as a means of attaining true freedom unless adequate provision is also made for orderly and peaceful relationships between the individual citizens themselves, in all the innumerable circumstances of friction which mark everyday life in a closely knit community. In the modern world ample experience has proved that democratic constitutions are not enough. They must be reinforced by a strong and respected body of civil and criminal law, designed to safeguard the liberty of the citizen from the attacks of predatory classes or associations or individuals.

Wars. Meanwhile the military power of Rome was steadily advancing. Her people were still in the main hardy and independent farmers, but they were ready to submit to the most rigorous military discipline in the service of their city. They suffered invasions of the Gauls, in the course of which Rome itself was sacked (390 B. C.). The Etruscans and other neighbouring peoples were conquered, and by the beginning of the third century before Christ, Rome was the undisputed mistress of central Italy. Then came a great war with Pyrrhus, one of the successors of Alexander in Greece, as the result of which the Roman power was extended over southern Italy also (281-275 B. C.).

Next Rome became engaged (264 B. C.) in a fierce and prolonged struggle with Carthage, the wealthy Phoenician trading city which has already been mentioned as building up, from her station on the southern coast of the Mediterranean, a great commercial empire with outposts as far away as Britain. Carthage produced, in Hannibal, one of the greatest generals in all history. He marched a small army out of Spain and over the Alps into Italy, and kept it there

for fifteen years, almost unsupported, but destroying army after army sent against him by Rome, and doing what he liked with the Roman territories. Only the lack of reinforcements and of the apparatus for conducting a great siege prevented him from capturing and destroying Rome herself.

It was not till 146 B. C. that Rome was finally victorious



The Bay of Carthage

in this tremendous struggle with Carthage, a struggle which by then had gone on for one hundred and twenty years. In that year Carthage was utterly destroyed. In the meantime Rome had become mistress of the Mediterranean world from Spain to Greece ; and a few years after the destruction of her great rival a large part of Asia Minor was added to what had now become the Roman Empire.

Senatorial Government. But the constant warfare had entirely changed the nature of the Roman state. Hannibal,

in devastating Italy, had destroyed the sturdy old farmer class. Instead of small farms there were now great estates, owned by rich capitalists and worked by gangs of slaves. The men who had been farmers were now professional soldiers, or had migrated to Rome, where they formed an idle mob, ripe for mischief, supplied—as at Athens—with cheap food at the expense of the state, and exercising an undue influence in the Assembly. For in Rome, as in Athens, direct democracy meant that, though every citizen had a vote in the Assembly, only dwellers in the city itself had time to use that vote.

Meanwhile, although the Roman citizenship was being gradually extended to other inhabitants of Italy, a great empire was in practice being governed by a city-state similar in its main features to the city-states whose success and failure we have already studied in Greece. Decisions of critical importance, affecting millions of subjects and demanding accurate knowledge or complete secrecy, had repeatedly to be made by the Roman government, which had also continually to conduct and provide for far-reaching and complicated military campaigns.

The result of this was the development at Rome of a new form of government, which is generally known as ‘oligarchy’—the rule of a few men, generally the experienced and wealthy.¹ The Senate became immensely powerful. It was composed of all who had held superior office in the state, and of others nominated at first by the Consuls, and later by the Censors. As we have seen, officers of state might be commoners as well as nobles; and they were all elected by the popular Assembly. The intense conservatism of the Roman mind, and the necessity for experienced leadership, caused the officers, as a rule, to be chosen from a narrow circle of great families, to which the tradition of government

¹ The term oligarchy had already been applied to a form of government which had occurred in some Greek city-states; but this was a type of selfish class-rule very different from the Roman oligarchy in its best days.

and authority had given especial qualifications and prestige. Nevertheless a new aristocracy sprang up, an aristocracy of office, which rested its claim to power not on descent from the ancient nobility, for both nobles and commoners were included in its ranks, but on the services which in the past it had rendered to the state.

Moreover, the brief term of office of the consuls, and the fact that they would be held responsible afterwards for what they did, made them naturally subservient to the Senate—the ‘Assembly of Kings’. The popular Assembly, again, was ready and willing to be led from victory to victory by the advice of such a body, since they themselves controlled the recruitment to it by their own votes, and shared in the spoils derived from its conquests. Thus in time the Senate of Rome came to govern the Mediterranean world with an almost absolute sway.

Its Decay. But the Roman character gave way under the temptations of empire. Power and plunder made many of the Senators almost fabulously rich. Money, and the things money can buy, began to exercise an ever-growing attraction and influence over the minds of men.¹ In the old days discipline in the Roman family had been very strict; for the Romans knew that no people can rule which cannot first obey. But later on the task of educating the young was largely left in the hands of slaves, who were often immoral and corrupt. It came to be a degenerate Greek education, chiefly in the art of ‘rhetoric’—the art of persuasive public speaking, of making black appear white, which was of supreme importance in the ancient city-state governed by direct democracy.

The city mob became increasingly clamorous for free food and unlimited gladiatorial shows, in which beasts and men were cruelly massacred to please the blood-thirsty populace.

¹ The first coins of which we have knowledge were minted in Lydia about 600 B. C. From that time the use of money, in replacement of barter, grew steadily.

The Senators who were sent abroad as provincial governors had full 'imperium' in their provinces during their term of office, and used it to loot, to force bribes, and to oppress their subjects in a thousand ways.

Meanwhile, however, amongst wars and popular clamour, and increasing luxury and corruption, the Roman genius for defining the relations between man and man continued steadily at its work; so that a great body of law was built up, applying not only to Roman citizens but also to dealings between Romans and foreigners.

Gradually, as the old Roman character degenerated, ambition for power became more fierce. The traditional prestige and trustworthiness of the Senate began to disappear. The struggle between rich and poor became once more acute; for the establishment of great estates throughout Italy meant the gathering in Rome of a mob of landless, discontented, indebted men, who had once been small farmers and free labourers. Thus came bitter party feeling and wild faction fighting.

Faction had been one of the chief reasons for the degeneration of the Greek city-state, and the greatest of Greek historians had said:

'The cause of all these evils was the love of power, originating in avarice and ambition, and the party-spirit which is engendered in men when they are fairly embarked in a contest. For the leaders on either side used specious names; the one party professing to uphold the constitutional equality of the many, the other the wisdom of an aristocracy, while they made the public interests, to which in name only they were devoted, in reality their prize. Striving in every way to overcome each other, they committed the most monstrous crimes. . . . And the citizens who were of neither party fell a prey to both.'¹

This description applies admirably also to the spirit of faction which, in the last hundred years of the Roman republic,


¹ Thucydides, i. 223: Jowett's translation.



The Rich



The Poor



The Villa



The Cottage

rent the state with a series of bloody civil wars, proscriptions, revolutions, and massacres.

On the one side was the popular party striving, often by violence and attempted revolution, for a larger share in wealth and power and the spoils of empire. On the other side was the Senatorial party, labouring by every means, fair and foul, to retain the rich prize which the subjugation of the Mediterranean world had placed in its hands.

Moreover, beyond Rome itself was the still unenfranchised portion of Italy, eager to win Roman citizenship, with its privileges of cheap corn and a share in the plunder of the world.

Meanwhile the great and victorious army of Rome became to an ever greater extent the one real force to be reckoned with in this welter of selfishness and faction. By the end of the second century before Christ it had become a long-service professional army of landless men, trained in violence, loyal to their general rather than to the state; for the state was so rent asunder by party divisions that a plain soldier could scarcely determine what the state was to which he should be loyal. The result was a succession of ambitious generals, who had been successful in warfare either at home or abroad, and who then endeavoured to use their prestige and their well-trained armies ostensibly to support one of the contending parties at Rome, but in reality to obtain supreme power for themselves.

The Beginnings of Imperial Rule. The first of these great military leaders was Marius, who, having conquered part of north Africa, and driven back a dangerous inroad of German invaders (102 B. C.), tried to seize political power at Rome, but failed because he hesitated which party to support.

Next, Sulla, having put down a great revolt in Asia Minor and another in Italy, came back supreme to Rome, supported the Senatorial party, and executed five thousand of the popular party (81 B. C.).

Then Pompey, having swept the pirates from the Mediterranean in a brilliant campaign of three months, and having conquered Syria, returned to maintain an uneasy ascendancy at Rome (61 B. C.), till he was in turn defeated and driven out by Julius Caesar, a far greater man than his predecessors, who had trained a magnificent army in the course of nine years of fierce warfare in France and Britain, and who came



Pompey




Julius Caesar

THE RIVALS

back to Rome as the champion of the popular party. Caesar became to all intents and purposes absolute dictator of the whole Roman world. His statue was even set up in a temple at Rome with the inscription, 'To the Unconquerable God'. But the leaders of the Senatorial party succeeded in assassinating him (44 B. C.) before he had had time to do more than make a beginning at his task—the task of organizing the world as a great machine controlled by the hands of one man.

The death of Julius Caesar was followed by fresh civil wars. But at last Octavian, or Augustus as he was afterwards named, became completely victorious and proceeded, with

admirable good sense, moderation, and practical capacity, to complete the work of Caesar (31 B. C.). The prestige and power of the Senate was as far as possible preserved, but Augustus kept in his own hands effective control of the army and of all the important departments of government. The word 'empire' came into existence because Augustus and his successors held the supreme 'imperium' throughout the



PLINY'S TUSCAN VILLA. Reconstruction by Schinkel

Roman world. He also took the position of supreme 'Tribune of the people'. Thus he united the old monarchical and aristocratic authority with the power of the chosen magistrate of the commons.


Augustus did his work of reorganization so thoroughly and wisely that the Empire of Rome endured for four hundred years after his death. During the first century after Christ the emperors were often bad, but fairly capable. Meanwhile the authority of the Senate became steadily more shadowy, in face of the growing power of the army and of the Emperor as its head. The corruption of the Roman character under the influence of luxury and world-power went on apace.

In the second century, the age of the Antonines, came a succession of hard-working, conscientious, and efficient emperors, under whom there was internal peace and a considerable measure of happiness and prosperity. The boundaries of the Empire were extended meanwhile from Scotland to the Persian Gulf.


Then came two centuries of decay, during which the frontiers were shattered and driven in by successive invasions of Aryan tribes, who were being thrust forward by the pressure of the Mongolian advance westward.

Military Despotism. Though the Roman Empire endured for so long, it became in reality little but a vast organization of tyranny and violence. The central power of the Emperor was upheld by naked force, by the support of the army alone. There was no rule of succession. When a strong Emperor died, or a weak one appeared, there was often a period of fierce civil war between ambitious generals till one of them conquered and exterminated his competitors. On one occasion the troops put the position of Emperor up to auction, and knocked it down to the highest bidder, dividing the price he paid for it amongst themselves.

The character of the Empire is well shown by the fact that its rulers, tyrannical and blood-stained as they often were, were yet worshipped as gods throughout their wide dominions, whilst those, for example the Christians, who would not so worship them were persecuted. In fact Emperor-worship became the official religion, and to refuse to share in it was regarded as a crime against the state. Thus freedom of conscience was savagely repressed. As time went on the control of the central government became so harsh and rigorous as to stamp out every other form of freedom. Society was based on slavery. The process went forward unchecked under which the free peasants tended to fall into hopeless debt, and to become the slaves of rich landowners, or at least their serfs—bound to serve on their estates without pay,



POMPEII. The excavation of a street. In the background a modern house built on the ashes covering the ancient city




ROMAN COLONIZATION. The remains of Tingad in northern Africa

forbidden to migrate elsewhere, and receiving for their services only a little patch of land to cultivate for themselves in their spare time. The rich men, in their turn, were mercilessly exploited by the Emperor's corrupt officials


During the first two centuries of the Empire there was indeed a considerable degree of freedom and happiness in the municipalities which dotted the provinces in great numbers. They were allowed certain powers of self-government, and the richer classes were able to keep up a fairly high standard of culture. But the grinding tyranny of the central government in time crushed the freedom and happiness of these municipalities also. By the end of the second century after Christ rich men had to be compelled by law to become and remain municipal councillors, so grievous were the burdens imposed upon those holding the office. Later on, enrolment amongst such municipal councillors was used by the government as a favourite method of punishment or annoyance for those with whom it was displeased. In time the middle classes of society disappeared, leaving only the very rich landowners and the miserably poor and oppressed peasantry and slaves.

Meanwhile in the big cities an organization of labour was springing up, so rigorous as to approximate to a genuine caste system. Most occupations became more or less completely hereditary, from that of the Senator to that of the baker. By the end of the third century all craftsmen and artisans were compelled to join trade unions under the control of the government, and were prevented by law from ever leaving their unions; for the observation of the Roman caste regulations was rigorously enforced by the law of the state. 'In the fourth century every member and all his sons and his property (however acquired) belonged inalienably to the trade union. . . . Any one who married the daughter of a unionist must join his father-in-law's business (later no one was allowed to marry out of his union). And thus the empire



HADRIAN'S VILLA. The Great Baths

was an immense gaol where all worked, not according to taste, but by force.' ¹ 'The tendency of the later Empire was to stereotype society by compelling men to follow the occupation of their fathers, and preventing a free circulation among different callings and grades of life. The man who brought the grain of Africa to the public stores at Ostia, the baker who made it into loaves for distribution, the butchers, the purveyors of wine and oil, the men who fed the furnaces of the public baths, were bound to their callings from one



A vast Roman Amphitheatre at El Djem

generation to another. It was the principle of rural serfdom applied to social functions. Every avenue of escape was closed. A man was bound to his calling not only by his father's, but by his mother's condition. Men were not allowed to marry out of their guild.' ²


Race Suicide. The earth was scoured to supply the materials of Roman luxury and the strange beasts which were in demand for the great public spectacles. The cruel gladiatorial shows claimed a host of victims and became increasingly popular and frequent. The number of public holidays annually devoted at Rome to such games and spectacles rose from

¹ Flinders Petrie, *Janus in Modern Life*, p. 37, quoted in Hubbard, *Fate of Empires*, p. 129.

² Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, p. 194.



Exhibitions and Contests of Wild Beasts (late Byzantine). A relief from the Balkans



ROMAN GLADIATORS

66 in the reign of Augustus to 175 or more in the fourth century. The sums set aside for the provision of cheap food became steadily larger. Thus the demoralization of the Roman people proceeded apace.

The most serious symptom of this demoralization was the



----- --
Tombstone of man and wife. The husband holds the testament,
the wife her ring

fact that marriage was becoming a hollow mockery. Divorce came to be practised for the flimsiest reasons. The large majority of men probably never married at all. The killing or exposing of new-born infants was very common. Sometimes they were drowned like puppies. 'Petronius, a writer of the time, says: "No one acknowledges children; for the man who has heirs is never invited to any festive gathering, but is left to associate with the dregs of society. On the other hand, the childless man is covered with honours, and passes

for a model of all the virtues." So great were the advantages of childlessness that Seneca (a great philosopher and statesman) consoles a mother who had just lost her only son by reminding her of the greater consideration that she will now enjoy (from people desiring to be made her heirs). A man who married was regarded as hardly in his senses.' ¹

Strenuous efforts were made to combat this disastrous process of race suicide by means of legislation. Taxes were remitted to those who had children; they were specially selected for promotion in the public service; they were given special rights of receiving legacies. The laws to encourage marriage were often rigorously enforced; but they failed of their purpose. Tacitus, the greatest of the Roman historians, says that in the first century marriage and bringing up children went entirely out of fashion, 'the advantage of having no children to inherit outweighing the penalty of disobedience'.

The natural result of such a state of affairs was that the Roman race in a great measure died out. It was replaced by ex-slaves who had purchased their freedom, by immigrants from other parts of the Empire, or, later, by barbarians from beyond the frontiers.

The Roman Empire became at last a hideous picture of culture without civilization—culture that was outwardly a barren show of splendour and luxury, but within was selfish and corrupt beyond belief. Rome spent the plunder of the world not only upon her own populace, but upon the existing generation of that populace, grudging future generations any share in the spoils. Rome and China are at opposite poles in their attitude to the family and to the claims of the future upon the present. Therefore Rome perished, but China endures.

The Frontiers. Meanwhile, as the Roman race tottered to


¹ Inge, *Society of Rome under the Caesars*, p. 31; see Hubbard, *Fate of Empires*, p. 141.

extinction, the Roman army became, in consequence, less and less adequate for the defence of the frontiers. It was allowed to become too weak and small. It was composed to an ever greater extent of barbarians from the outlying districts of the Empire, or from beyond its limits. Such barbarians, being mercenary foreign troops, were always ready for revolt or for civil war if they saw a prospect of better pay or more plunder. With almost incredible folly the Romans 'took the barbarians into their legions, taught them the arts of war, marched them about the Empire, and returned them, with their lesson well learnt, to their own people'. Thus the Empire prepared the way for its own overthrow. In a crisis the armies were even recruited with slaves.

Moreover, the land-frontiers of the Roman Empire were exceedingly ill-fitted for defence. They were enormously long, and were not naturally strong. In the centre of the north-eastern frontier, and projecting southward to within a dangerously short distance of Italy itself, was Germany—a wild land of fierce tribes which had never been subdued, and which were ready, as soon as the hand of the Roman government weakened and the pressure from the east became too urgent, to strike swiftly at the heart of the Empire.

Apart from the making of good roads the Romans did nothing to apply or extend the scientific inventions of the Greeks in their organization of defence and of communications. They never even made proper use of the Mediterranean, the centre and base of all their dominions, as a means of trade and of swift transport. Their armies were marched by land. Their ships were clumsy and inefficient. Piracy was a continual plague; and the barbarians were at last permitted to become masters of the western part of the Mediterranean without so much as a big naval battle. Military tyranny, luxury, and race suicide had numbed men's brains.

Patriotism in the true sense there was none; for to the



ROMAN ROAD IN SYRIA

mass of the people the Empire was not only not worth fighting for, but was a vast and odious adversary crushing the life out of mankind. The meaning of free citizenship, as the Greeks had known it, had long sunk in oblivion. Travel was prohibited.¹ A man might not even change his residence, for fear he should evade the tax-collector. So men's minds stagnated in petty local interests, and the State was to them only a cruel tyranny which robbed and persecuted them and failed to avert barbarian invasions. But indeed to the mass of the people the barbarians came as deliverers.²

The Fall of Rome. When at last wave after wave of wild invaders submerged the Empire, they did for mankind an invaluable service of destruction in the clearing away of the remnants of this rotting culture.

The invaders first appeared in a really dangerous form in A. D. 247, when the Goths, a Germanic tribe coming from the north, crossed the Danube, destroyed the Roman province of Dacia (Rumania and Transylvania), and defeated and killed the Emperor Decius himself.

Thenceforward the Empire had but little peace. Tribe followed tribe; invasion followed invasion. Sometimes former invaders, having settled within the Empire, fought for Rome against later comers. Sometimes they rebelled and joined forces with the new enemy. But the frontiers were steadily forced inwards, until in A. D. 410 Alaric the Goth marched into Italy and captured Rome itself.

Later, the Mongolian Huns, who had all this time been forcing the Aryans westward, entered what had been the Empire, under the leadership of a terrible chieftain named Attila. They were beaten back by the combined Goths and Romans at the great battle of Chalons (A. D. 451), in which one hundred and fifty thousand men were killed; but this

¹ Davis, *Mediaeval Europe*, p. 19.


² Acknowledgements are especially due to Wells's *Outline of History* in this section.

ROME

the Road ~ Maker

English Miles

0 100 200 300



defeat did not prevent Attila from devastating Italy the next year.

Meanwhile barbarian tribes entered Spain and Africa, France and Britain. They pillaged Rome again in A. D. 455, and in A. D. 476 the last Roman Emperor resigned his throne, to be succeeded a few years later by a Gothic chieftain, named Theodoric, as King of Italy.

The Influence of Rome on the World. 1. *The Idea of the World-State.* The abuses and corruptions which accompanied the slow death of the Roman Empire must not blind our eyes to the fact that, in three respects at least, Rome made a great contribution to civilization.

In the first place men's minds became accustomed to the idea of a world-state. That idea, as we have seen, originated in the brief and splendid career of Alexander; but in the course of the five centuries or so during which Rome was mistress of the Mediterranean regions and of north-western Europe, the world-state became one of the most ordinary conceptions of mankind. The world-rule of the emperors was marred by a hundred vices, so that civilization decayed away and freedom disappeared; but still that world-rule deeply implanted in men's minds the great idea that humanity is actually one, and that men may therefore dwell peacefully and unitedly together under one political system. Humanity is still, painfully and with small success, striving to regain and to put into practice that same idea.

Under the later Empire the instincts and activities of men were not freely harnessed to the service of the world; for there was little or no freedom, and instinct was basely indulged in a selfish struggle for present advantage and pleasure, which brought disaster and extinction to the Roman race; but still the Western world *had been one* for many generations, and hence men even now look back to the Roman Empire as a concrete proof that unity is not an impossible ideal.

2. *The Church.* Secondly, the universal Empire had been

the nursery of the universal Church. In spite of persecution and hatred the Christian community had spread far and wide, had organized itself under a strong central control, and had finally, in the reigns of Constantine the Great, A. D. 306-37, and his successors, become the official religion of the whole state. When the barbarian inroads shattered the outward unity of mankind, the spiritual unity of Western Christianity endured for eleven centuries longer—long enough to train barbarian Europe for the revival of civilization.

Moreover, though in public life the degeneration of the Empire went steadily forward from bad to worse, in private morals the Church, by the time of the barbarian conquest, was already accomplishing a marked reformation.¹ She was too late to save the Roman race from self-destruction; but after that race had fallen, the Church's teaching and the example of her saints bore rich fruit amongst the successors of the Romans

3. *Law.* In the third place, Rome, as we have seen, gave Law to the world—not the constitutional law which we owe to Greece, and which declares how freedom may best be secured to all the citizens of an independent democracy, but the civil and criminal law, which declares how the rights of person and property may best be safeguarded. The Romans always had a deep veneration for rules and forms; and in consequence they discovered, preserved, developed, and consolidated, with admirable exactitude, the best methods of securing justice between man and man. The Roman citizenship was extended, first to all Italians, and then, at the beginning of the third century A. D., to all free inhabitants of the Empire. Thus the one uniform legal system of Rome came universally into force from the Clyde to the Euphrates.

¹ Christian opinion succeeded in putting a stop to the gladiatorial combats. It is said that this was rendered possible by the courage and self-sacrifice of a Syrian hermit, Telemachus, who sprang into the arena to separate the gladiators. He was killed, but his death produced such an impression that the 'games' were finally stopped.

It was perfected by a series of expert lawyers, and was finally codified by the Emperor Justinian (A. D. 527-63). Though it was largely forgotten in the barbarian ages, yet in France and Italy at least it endured in a corrupt and mutilated state till it was rediscovered and reapplied in the later medieval and modern periods. To-day it forms the basis of law in all the chief European states, except England.



THE WALLS OF CONSTANTINOPLE

The Eastern Empire. We have already noticed that the Roman frontiers were too extensive and too weakly defended. The emperors had spread their power too far. In spite of the great Roman roads it was impossible to concentrate troops in adequate numbers and with sufficient speed at any point on the long frontiers where a barbarian inroad suddenly threatened. Moreover, the danger existed not only on the northern and north-eastern frontiers—on the Roman wall across the north of England, or on the Rhine and Danube—it existed also on the far eastern frontier, where a new and strong Persian Empire had sprung up.

In order that neither of these dangerous zones might be

neglected, the great Emperor Diocletian, at the end of the third century, adopted the plan of appointing a colleague with a full share of imperial power who should guard the West, whilst he himself administered the East.

A generation later Constantine, the first Christian emperor, was deeply impressed by the magnificent situation of Byzantium (on the Bosphorus between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean) as a meeting-place of land and sea communications, and as a central point for co-ordinating the defence of the threatened frontiers.

Accordingly he removed the capital of the Empire to that city, and re-founded it under the name of Constantinople. That this bold stroke of statesmanship was abundantly justified is shown by the fact that the Eastern Empire of Constantinople held out against the invaders for more than a thousand years after the fall of Rome itself. For the Empire soon after the time of Constantine was divided into




Coin of Constantine. Standard surmounted by the monogram of Christ

two halves, a western and an eastern, dependent respectively upon Rome and Constantinople.

This division of the Empire was yet another cause of the Roman decay; for the all-important frontier line of the Danube was shared between the two governments of west and east, neither of which properly supported the other when an invasion occurred. Thus the splitting of the Empire hastened the doom of Rome, but provided for the survival in Constantinople of much that was of extreme importance for the future.

The Eastern Empire was only in part Roman. Both its culture and its language were Greek. Except as regards its legal system it was the successor of the Empire of Alexander




THE GOLDEN HORN

rather than of the Empire of Augustus. It had many great rulers, amongst whom was Justinian—already mentioned as the final codifier of the Roman Law. Under him the dominions subject to Constantinople were greatly extended, and Italy and Africa were recovered from the barbarians.

After the rise of the Arabs Constantinople served for many centuries as the eastern bulwark of Europe against their invasions, and afterwards against those of the Seljuk and Ottoman Turks. In spite of a court life built up on innumerable senseless ceremonies, and torn by plots and treacheries, in spite also of the old Greek curse of party hatred amongst the populace, the Eastern Empire kept dimly alight, through those ten dark centuries, the lamp of Greek learning and culture, and the tradition that freedom had once existed on earth. In A. D. 1453, the imperial city, so long impregnable to assault, was finally captured by the Ottoman Turks. Even before its fall Greek scholars and Greek manuscripts had begun drifting west to Italy, where poetry, sculpture, and painting

were being brought to a new pitch of beauty. After its fall this tendency greatly increased, and the knowledge of Greek truth and Greek liberty spread fast. Kings and Popes competed for ancient manuscripts; and the 'New Learning', which was the old learning of Greece re-




An engraving of Constantinople in 1620

discovered, gave Europe a new impulse to political and literary effort. Constantine's admirable choice of a strong capital, and the Eastern Empire after him, had preserved through the barbaric ages Greek ideals of civilization.

The Division of Italy. Only fifteen years after Justinian had reconquered Italy from the barbarians, and made it into a province of the Eastern Empire, there came another great flood of Aryan invaders, the Lombards. They swept away most of the handiwork of the great Emperor, establish-

ing a barbarian kingdom in northern Italy and two more barbarian states in the south. As the centre still belonged to the Eastern Empire, Italy was thus shattered into fragments—fragments which were not again to be united till 1870.



An Italian View of the Northern Invader



VI

The Middle Ages

Feudalism. The first waves of barbarian conquerors had been deeply affected by the Roman culture, which was still vigorous in their time. They adopted and even extended the Roman Law, sometimes claimed to be allies of Constantinople, and even modelled the organization of their states on that of their imperial predecessor, for which they often expressed the greatest admiration. Thus one of the earlier invading chieftains declared, 'When I was young I desired to obliterate the Roman name and to bring under the sway of the Goths all that once belonged to the Romans. But I learned better by experience. The Goths were licentious barbarians who would obey no laws; and to deprive the commonwealth of laws would have been a crime. So for my part I chose the glory of restoring the Roman name to its old estate.'¹

But these earlier invaders, some of whom had actually been trained in the armies of the old Empire, were soon in their turn conquered by succeeding tribes, who at first knew little of and cared less for the Roman name and the Roman culture. Thus by A. D. 600 France was held by Franks, most of Italy by Lombards, England by Teutonic tribes, and Spain by

¹ Words of Artaulf, brother-in-law of Alane the Goth, quoted in Davis, *Medieval Europe*.

West Goths.¹ These races began to build up a new form of government and social order, founded on the old nomad relationships between the tribal chieftain, the nobles (his companions in war and the heads of the tribal families), the mass of the people of the tribe, and conquered populations. This new organization is called Feudalism. In its origin it may be compared to the caste system in India, which was developed under somewhat similar conditions—the need for a method by which invading and conquering, but still primitive, Aryan peoples might organize their conquests with a view to permanent settlement. Feudalism was not, however, complicated by a colour-bar; and it did not develop its own religious sanctions and its own priestly class to reinforce its growing organization; for the invaders adopted Christianity. It was also continually influenced by the fact that it lived amongst the relics of a great past civilization, and by the Christian teachings of brotherhood and equality and world service.²

Moreover Feudalism was built up under continual shocks of war. Indeed it was mainly a military system devised to render easy defence and the collection of armies—armies which were always hungering for fresh conquests. Hence conditions were wanting for the steady development of industry, and for the peaceful absorption of alien tribes into new castes—factors which made the caste system so pervasive and so strong in India, and connected it so closely with the economic life of the people.

Yet, though this was so, Feudalism—in addition to many defects peculiar to itself—had all the most disastrous features of the caste system. Man was divided from man, and class

¹ These West Goths belonged to the first great wave of invasion; but their fanatical devotion to a type of Christianity hated by the rest of the Roman world prevented their sharing as they might have done in the Roman culture

² The feudal organization of land tenure and serfdom was largely inherited from the later Roman Empire.

from class, by barriers which for centuries defied assault, and relentlessly forbade the building up of a strong and united national life. The dead weight of ancient prejudice fatally hampered progress towards civilization. Amongst the lower orders the guild system in industry, though it protected the interests of its members, hindered the improvement of manufacturing methods. Pride of birth blinded men's eyes to the fact that equally honourable service can be rendered to the community by rich and poor, high-born and low-born.

The Fundamental Ideas of Feudalism. Feudalism was firmly fastened upon Europe, especially upon France, by the time the menace of Arab conquest had died away in the middle of the eighth century. It was founded upon two fundamental ideas: first, that every man must have a 'Lord', who protects him, and whom in turn he serves: second, that the holding of land is the basis of all political and social relationships.

The King was the ultimate owner of all the land held by the community. He was the supreme lord, under God. He shared some of his land with his companions in war and the heads of the great families, i. e. the barons or nobles. These nobles were required in return for their land to pay him 'homage', the sign of respect and loyalty and the acknowledgement of service owed.¹ Such service generally took the form of the supply of troops in war time. The King was bound to consult his nobles collectively in all matters of importance.

The nobles in their turn shared the lands granted to them with sub-tenants, corresponding to the common people of the old Aryan tribes. In return for his land the sub-tenant was required to do homage to his lord, and to pay him service

¹ Homage was paid by the 'vassal' kneeling before his lord with his hands between his lord's hands, and promising him loyalty and service.

by raising his own share of the troops which the lord had to supply to the King.¹

Beneath the sub-tenants were the conquered populations—men with no real place in the feudal system, because they were landless. They became therefore, serfs, land-slaves bound to spend their lives on one estate, and to serve the master of it by unpaid labour on his lands, receiving in return a patch of ground to cultivate for themselves.


In some countries the common people of the invading tribes settled into communal villages, in which the land was held and worked in common by free sub-tenants, each family receiving—generally in a yearly redistribution of the lands—as much as it needed for its own maintenance. In such villages the families often held their land in scattered strips, some good for one purpose and some for another, so that all might share alike in the communal lands.

Not only the serfs, but also the town-dwellers, were really outside the feudal system; for the latter lived by trade, and not on the land. But since feudalism demanded that a 'lord' be found for every man, townsmen were originally treated as serfs under the lord on whose land their town happened to be situated.

It was essential to the feudal system that rank and position and land should descend from father to son. In some countries, notably France and Germany, a noble's estates were divided amongst all his sons, who all also held noble rank. This led to division and subdivision of the estates, and to the anarchy of a very numerous and very poverty stricken nobility. In England, on the other hand, only the eldest son was regarded as noble, and inherited the whole estate.

Tenacious as they were of their own hereditary rights and position, the feudal nobles wherever possible endeavoured, in

¹ A strong king, like William I of England, would insist that the homage of sub-tenants be paid direct to himself, thus greatly weakening the nobility.



‘ The rich man in his castle,
The poor man at his gate ’

(Jean Fouquet's illustration of Job in the costume of his own time,
15th century)

order to increase their own power, to frustrate the King's claim to hand on his position to his eldest son, i. e. to prevent the kingship becoming hereditary. They attempted to make permanent and effective the primitive principle, already noticed, by which the King was chosen by the nobles and might be deposed by them.

The Evils of Feudalism. The great merit of the feudal system was its simplicity. In a barbarous age it supplied a rough-and-ready method of administration, of defence, and of justice. For it was the duty of a lord not only to protect his vassals from external aggression, but to do justice amongst them according to the custom of the land. Feudalism also taught a crude morality of its own—the idea that a man has duties and services to perform, as well as rights to claim, and that it is the duty of the strong to protect their weaker dependants. But the scope of the service thus taught was fatally narrow, and the defects of feudalism outweighed its merits. It established in perpetual and arbitrary dominance a close hereditary class of landowners. There was always a tendency for these landowners to shake off the control of the King and to become independent tyrants. The rule of equal universal law was forgotten, and a thousand local usages, administered at the lords' caprice, sprang up all over Europe. Industry and learning were despised; for a military career was regarded as the only respectable occupation. The central control of organized government was seriously weakened by the granting away of estates and powers, and by the constant revolts of ambitious nobles. War, conquest, and plunder were the breath of life to the nobility; for every lord had his band of soldier-retainers to keep up, in order that they might be ready when the King called for them. The only way to hold such private armies together in that fierce age was by providing them with plenty of adventure and loot. Feudal Europe was studded with castles, the strongholds of oppressive and predatory

barons. The land-hunger of these barons—their constant effort to obtain fresh estates where they might, if possible, be independent of any overlord—brought disaster and misery on every country from Ireland to Palestine.

At its best feudalism was a rigorous caste organization of society, under which all classes lived and worked in their own separate and hereditary spheres, though in constant dread of an outbreak of anarchy from the latent forces of disorder. At its worst—under a weak king—feudalism was a nightmare of indiscriminate rapine and massacre ; it was violent anarchy perpetuated for their own base advantage by a cruel and irresponsible aristocracy.

The Forces that combated Feudalism. Feudalism prevailed over large parts of Europe for some seven centuries. With the rise of strong national monarchies at the close of the fifteenth century it may be said to have ceased any longer to supply the controlling forces and ideas of European life. But until the end of the eighteenth century many of its institutions survived, showing a green and vigorous old age even in such an enlightened country as France, whilst elsewhere they were much stronger. In our own days the traditions of feudalism are still powerful enough seriously to fetter freedom in lands which in many respects are well advanced towards civilization.

There were a number of forces which gradually combined to weaken this barbarian grip upon a continent which had once seen the vision of Greek liberty.

1. *The Holy Roman Empire.* In the days when feudalism was still forming there arose a great King of the Franks called Charlemagne (A. D. 771–814). He was grandson of that Charles Martel who had driven back the Arabs in the battle of Tours. His father Pepin had relieved Rome from a threatened conquest at the hands of the Lombards, and had bestowed upon the Pope (the Bishop of Rome) the territories in central Italy which not long before had been conquered


by the Lombards from the Eastern Empire. These territories were afterwards known as the Papal States, and the gift of them as Pepin's Donation. Their existence as a separate state in Italy rendered still more hopeless the prospect of Italian unity, and many centuries later proved to be one of the chief obstacles in the way of the attainment of that unity.

Charlemagne inherited from his father an empire covering modern France, the Netherlands, and the western part of Germany. This empire he largely extended, especially in Germany and Spain. He also became King, by conquest, of the Lombards in Italy. In addition to his dominions Charlemagne inherited from Pepin the idea of befriending and protecting the Pope, who by this time had come to be recognized in southern and western Europe as the head of the Christian Church.¹ Accordingly, Charlemagne renewed his father's Donation, and made a treaty of eternal friendship with the Papacy. Finally, in A. D. 800, he was crowned in Rome, by the Pope, as Emperor of the Romans. Thus Europe again had a Roman Emperor, and in name she retained him for a thousand years, till 1806.

But the new Empire was very different from the old. In the first place it existed, in theory, to defend and to extend the Church and her religion. Therefore it was called 'The Holy Roman Empire'. The Pope and the Emperor frequently quarrelled and fought with each other, but this did not affect the theory about the holiness of the Empire. In the second place, although the seat of the Empire was nominally Rome, where the emperors were supposed to be crowned, yet the centre of power lay always north of the Alps, and many emperors held but little authority in Italy. Indeed Italy was periodically devastated by the attempts of ambitious

¹ Later the Church of the Eastern Empire, with its head-quarters in Constantinople, became quite distinct from the Roman Church of western Europe.

emperors to make their authority more effective there. In the third place the Emperor came to be primarily a German king. He was elected to the Empire, and elected by various princes and potentates of Germany. They chose for Emperor some one who was already a German ruler, and on his election



they became his vassals, generally unruly vassals. Thus the Empire was German rather than Italian, and it suffered from the worst weaknesses of a feudal state.

The empire of Charlemagne was soon split up. For a time feudalism flourished unchecked amongst its ruins, the great nobles vying with each other in their eagerness to become independent rulers and in their lawless pillaging and oppression. 'The freedom of the aristocracy spelled misery for every other class. These self-constituted tyrants passed their lives in devastating faction fights. Worst of all, their divisions,

and their absorption in petty schemes of personal aggrandizement, left Europe at the mercy of uncivilized invaders.'

For there came in the ninth century another great wave of barbarian invasion. The Scandinavian Danes and Northmen (later called in France Normans) attacked Europe from the north, while the Mongolian Hungarians or Magyars did so from the east. Meanwhile, in the south, Arab sea-raiders were devastating the Mediterranean coasts. Hence the peoples of Europe were ready and glad when Henry the Fowler (A. D. 919-36) became King in Germany and began to build up a barrier against both barbarian invasion and feudal anarchy. In the middle of the tenth century Henry's son, Otto the Great, decisively defeated the Hungarian invaders. Some years later he entered Italy, and was crowned Emperor at Rome. Thenceforward, as we have just noticed, the Holy Roman Empire was inseparably united to the German monarchy, and the Emperor became, and remained, in reality a German potentate with claims to Italy and to suzerainty over other sovereigns, though often with a real sense of mission as the protector of the Church.

In the eleventh century the Empire was extended eastward by Henry III. Soon after, in the same century, it was involved in a struggle for supremacy with the Papacy, which had become exceedingly strong under the great Pope Gregory VII.

In the twelfth century the Empire rendered good service in checking, by its superior power and prestige, the anarchy of German feudalism; for a time it also led the crusading movement. In the thirteenth century the Emperor Frederick II (A. D. 1212-50) acquired temporary possession of Jerusalem, and the Empire shared in the task of resisting the invading Mongols, who overran eastern Europe under the successors of the great conqueror Jenghiz Khan. But the Empire nearly collapsed in a bitter and prolonged struggle against Pope after Pope on the question whether the Papacy or the Empire should have greater political power.

In the sixteenth century the Empire at first gained vastly in strength and prestige under Charles V., but afterwards was dangerously weakened by the same Emperor's prolonged struggles with France, and by his failure to settle the religious disputes between Catholics and Protestants. This failure strengthened the German feudal princes in their opposition to the central control of the Emperor. Many of them became practically independent rulers.

In the seventeenth century the Emperor, who by then had his main strength in Austria, made a determined attempt, in the terrible Thirty Years' War (1618-48), to regain his lost power and to settle the religious disputes in favour of the Roman Catholics; but the attempt was a disastrous failure. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Empire was also seriously weakened by the vigorous attacks of the Turks, who in 1529 besieged Vienna, the capital of the imperial Hapsburg dynasty. However, by protecting disunited Germany from this fresh Asiatic inroad the Emperor did most important service for Europe.

The Services of the Empire. The ideal underlying the Holy Roman Empire was that of the reuniting of the Continent into one universal state under the spiritual headship of the Pope and the temporal headship of the Emperor. This ideal was never fulfilled. Feudalism was too strong at first, and nationalism was too strong later on. Moreover, the imperial power was paralysed at its very centre by the persistence of the old nomad-Aryan idea that the King (or in this case the Emperor) must be elected by his peers.

Even Germany, the true seat of the Empire, was never united by it, but after the twelfth century sank ever deeper into the abyss of anarchy. As we have seen, the Protestant Reformation merely accentuated this anarchy by giving added power and prestige to the German princes, whilst in the Thirty Years' War the same process was carried still farther. It was not till the eighteenth century that the strong hand

of Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, began to achieve the task in which so many emperors had failed. That task was not completed till Germany was effectually united in 1871.

Yet, although the weak emperors were merely the figure-heads of a loose confederation of German feudal princes, the strong emperors—in spite of their unfortunate Italian ambitions—exercised a sufficient check upon the evils of German feudalism to justify us in placing the Empire amongst the forces which combined to weaken this barbaric grip upon Europe. A strong emperor could generally succeed in securing election for his son after him, and as a matter of fact the imperial power was in the great majority of cases conferred upon a member of the reigning family. The ideal of universal rule was kept alive ; and all Europe knew that in the Empire there existed a force, however clumsy and feeble, which stood for something wider and loftier than the selfish and narrow-minded violence of the ordinary feudal community.

One interesting weapon which the strong emperors used against feudalism in its worst days was the Land Peace. Generally this was merely an order to stop private warfare, murder, and rapine in some special part of the Empire. However, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries two great emperors, Frederick Barbarossa and his grandson, Frederick II, imposed permanent Land Peaces, which formed regular codes of law aimed at the total suppression of feudal outrage. They were an impracticable ideal at that time, but they showed a glimmer of light in the darkness.


2. *The Papacy.* A second great force working to curb feudalism, and a far more important and effective force than the Holy Roman Empire, was the medieval Church. In the time of Gregory VII, the great papal statesman of the eleventh century, that Church stood for the absolute supremacy of religion, as centrally organized and controlled under the Papacy, over all secular governments and rulers. Gregory

exercised an extraordinary ascendancy over the potentates of his day. He forced to submission even the great Emperor Henry IV by excommunicating him and absolving his subjects from their duty of obeying his orders.¹ When Henry asked forgiveness, he was made to wait three days in a castle at Canossa (in the Apennines), where the Pope was staying, before Gregory would grant him an interview. Clearly in the Pope of that era there was a universal ruler, more august than the greatest earthly potentate, able to enforce far and wide the commands of religion and humanity. It seemed that Europe was to realize once more the ideal of the world-state, under the bond not of the military despotism of old Rome, but of a spiritual power representing a religion of love and brotherhood and equality.

The Papacy had come to this pitch of greatness by a long process of gradual growth. The Popes claimed that St. Peter had been given by Christ the chief position amongst his disciples, and had afterwards become the first Bishop of Rome. In consequence of this, especial authority in matters of arbitration, of appeal, and of the interpretation of tradition, had from an early period been given, by common consent of the Christians in the western part of the Roman Empire, to the Bishop of Rome—the Pope. By the middle of the fifth century the decisions of the Pope on such questions had come to be recognized by the Roman Emperor as having the force of law. Later, the Pope gained added importance as a central organizing authority in the missionary labours of the Church amongst the savage invaders of the old Empire—especially in England—and beyond the borders of the old Empire in Germany. He also acquired great prestige from the respect and help given to him by the orthodox Frankish kings, and above all from the fact that it was a Pope who crowned Charlemagne Emperor; for by this coronation the idea was

¹ Excommunication implied exclusion from the Church and all her benefits in this world and the next.

definitely established that the spiritual power of the Papacy was above the most exalted temporal power in the world: the Pope was seen to be the maker even of emperors. Moreover, the Papacy had by this time been strengthened, as we have already seen, by the gift of a kingdom in central Italy. The Donation of Pepin, confirmed by Charlemagne, gave to the Pope the sinews of temporal power wherewith to substantiate



Notandum itaq. est quia prius foramen in pariete
accidende ostiū cernitur & tunc demum occulta
abominatio demonstrat. quia nimirum uniuscui
que peccati prius signa foris secus. deinde ianua
apertae iniquitatis ostendit. & tunc demum omne malū
quod intus latet aperitur. Nonnulla autem sunt lenit
arguenda nā cū non malicia sed sola ignorantia & inhi
mitate delinquit. pfecto necesse ē ut magno mode
ramine ipsa delicta correptio temperet. Omnia

The *De Cura Pastoralis* of Pope Gregory the Great.
An eleventh-century MS.

his spiritual claims; these he supported also by the so-called 'Donation of Constantine', later proved to be a forgery.

In the tenth century the prestige of the Popes was still further extended and consolidated by the coronation at Rome of Otto the Great, and by the alliance of the Papacy with the great reforming order called the Cluniacs,¹ which sought to purge the Church from many abuses and to free it from all secular control. By the middle of the twelfth century the Cluniacs controlled over three hundred monasteries in various

¹ From the monastery of Cluny, in France.

parts of Europe, and their influence was predominant in the counsels of the Church.


In the eleventh and succeeding centuries there came a series of statesmen-Popes, who impressed upon Europe the idea that 'the Church stands to the State in the relation of the head to the members, of the soul to the body', and that the Pope was the absolute head of this Church. When a ruler dared to disobey the papal commands, that ruler was brought to submission by being excommunicated, or by having his country laid under an interdict, which meant that no one in that country could be baptized, married, or buried with the rites of religion. This, to the medieval mind, meant that the whole population ran a grave risk of undergoing eternal torment in hell.

Thus for a time it seemed that Europe might actually be reunited in a confederation of monarchs under the guidance of a central authority which stood, in spite of many defects, for mercy, for progress towards civilization, and for enlightened spiritual leadership in an age of anarchy and barbarism.

This hope seemed for a brief period to grow still brighter as Europe responded with extraordinary enthusiasm to the papal appeals for the organization of the earlier Crusades. As feudal armies, drawn from the remotest regions of north and west, as well as from the more cultured south, moved onward in a common fervour to the conquest of the Holy Land, it seemed that the Continent was indeed united once more, and under a ruler who claimed to be the representative of Christ on earth.

The Failure of the Papacy. But the Crusades, which opened so brightly and with such generous sacrifice, were only a partial success—wrecked by the land-hunger and quarrels of the feudal potentates who led the Christian armies. The papal claims met with implacable opposition from the great emperors of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Italy was rent and devastated by the consequent wars, Pope

struggling with emperor, citizen with noble, one town with its neighbour. The Popes descended to the use of persecution, treachery, espionage, torture, and massacre in order to further the cause of their supremacy. In the fourteenth



THE PALAIS DES PAPES, AVIGNON

century the Popes fell completely under the control of the strong French monarchy, and the seat of their government was removed from Rome to Avignon in France. Finally the elective character of the Papacy, always open to grave abuses, led to a dispute as to the papal succession; and Europe saw two Popes, and later even three, hurling their spiritual thunderbolts against each other.


More important, however, than all these causes for the failure of European consolidation under the guidance of the Papacy was the growth of national spirit and of national monarchy. The Pope could compel submission to his claims from a weak king. But as this brought disgrace upon the king and thereby an access of strength to his feudal nobles, it was

resented by the national pride and the desire for strong central government which were growing amongst the common people. A strong king, who repressed his nobles and brought glory to the national arms, could in time defy the claims of the Pope, and by so doing win respect and popularity from the mass of his subjects, amongst whom, moreover, the slow spread of enlightenment was rendering ineffective the papal weapons of excommunication and interdict.

The Services of the Papacy. The Papacy failed in its great effort to consolidate Europe under a spiritual rule; but it, and the Church it led, had conferred immense benefits upon mankind.

In a thousand ways the Church combated the cruelty and lawlessness of feudalism. One weapon, used especially in France for this attack upon

feudalism, was the institution of the 'Truce of God'. 'This Truce, which all men were incited to swear they would observe, forbade the molestation of ecclesiastics, peasants, and other non-combatants: provided that cultivated land should not be harried or cattle carried off, and named certain seasons when no war should be waged. A typical agreement of this kind enjoins that all private hostilities shall be suspended from Wednesday evening to



'Feudal cruelty.' The cage in the dungeon of Loches in which Louis XI imprisoned Cardinal La Balue

Monday morning in each week,' and for large parts of each year.¹

Feudal potentates, small and great, were constantly compelled by respect for the Church and her powers to curb their rapacious retainers, to restore ill-gotten gains, and to observe at least outwardly some sort of decency and order. Indeed for centuries the Church was practically the only evidence of culture and of the possibility of civilized life existing throughout the major part of Europe. She undertook the teaching of morality and of Christian institutions to fresh invaders and settlers, and to the savage tribes beyond. In her monasteries the wisdom of Greece and Rome was preserved. There also the ancient manuscripts were carefully and reverently copied and recopied. Amongst her clergy the tradition of learning endured when it was forgotten or despised by all other classes. Later, it was in the shelter of the Church that the universities sprang up, and the wisdom of the ancients came again into the light of day. Churchmen, or men trained by and for the Church, not only furnished many of the principal statesmen of the Middle Ages, but were the leaders in the quest for truth, in the revival of classical studies, and in the criticism of medieval institutions and ideas. The Church thus played a most important part in the Renaissance and the Reformation—the great movements which mark the change from the Middle Ages to modern Europe.

Century after century, amidst the violence and anarchy of the feudal period, the Church, represented by thousands of saintly and devoted men and women, was carrying on a continuous quiet process of instruction and refinement. Under that process barbarism was being taught the beauty of mercy and saintliness, and of obedience to a divine law of brotherhood transcending feudal cruelty and selfishness.

Though the Papacy failed in its effort to reunite Europe

¹ Davis, *Mediaeval Europe*, p. 103.

under its own guidance, yet the Church had large success in her efforts to control feudalism and to lift the peoples out of darkness and savagery.

3. *The Towns.* Another potent factor in the weakening of feudal anarchy may be found in the medieval towns. We have already seen that there was no real place for a town and its inhabitants in the genuinely feudal organization of society, except as a collection of serfs under the control of the feudal lord on whose land their community happened to be situated. However, as the barbarians settled down, trade and manufacture began to develop, and hence the burghers became richer and richer. At some time or other the feudal overlord of the town would be certain to be in desperate need of money; for retainers were expensive to keep, and the fitting out of contingents for feudal warfare meant heavy demands for ready cash. Thus the lord would be glad to meet his needs by borrowing from his burghers. In return he would give them a charter—a document declaring that the town had certain definite rights and liberties. In many cases, where the central monarchy was strong, charters were purchased direct from the king.


During the Middle Ages the trade routes from the East had their western termination in the towns of North Italy and North Germany,¹ which accordingly became exceedingly wealthy, as also did the cities of the Netherlands, whose inhabitants developed at an early period a remarkable degree of skill both as craftsmen and traders. Accordingly in these regions many towns grew so rich that they were able to purchase almost entire independence, and are known as Free Towns.

¹ There were two main trade-routes with Asia in the Middle Ages. The northern one came up the Volga, and thence to the Baltic coast. By A. D. 1400 there were eighty cities of the Baltic and North Germany united in the great Hanseatic League for the control of this and other forms of trade. The southern route came up the Red Sea or the Persian Gulf, across the land to the ports of the eastern Mediterranean, and thence to Venice, Genoa, and other North Italian towns.

Elsewhere a number of specific rights and privileges would be purchased by the citizens. They would be permitted, for instance, to pay rent instead of performing their serf-duty on the lands of the lord. Next they would be permitted to hold markets and fairs, and to settle disputes connected therewith amongst themselves without taking them to the lord's court for decision. Later, they would form a merchant guild—an association of the chief traders of the town, often endowed with wide powers of control over its commerce. Craft guilds would follow, associations of the workers in each department of manufacture (for example, guilds of goldsmiths, weavers, and bakers), with power to control hours of labour, to regulate the standard of workmanship, to organize the training of apprentices, and so forth. Thus the process would go on, rights being purchased singly as opportunity offered, until a very substantial degree of freedom had been obtained and guaranteed by the all-important charters.

The stormy epoch of the Crusades, when the feudal nobility in every country of Europe sorely needed money with which to fit out contingents for the Holy Land, hastened the progress of the towns and the process of the granting of charters. Later, the chronic need for money on the part of the nobility led not only to the increasing sale of charters, but also in some countries to the first beginnings of freedom for the serfs, who were permitted to substitute the payment of money-rent for the old forced labour on their lords' estates. In England many such tenant peasants held copies of the agreement with their lords by which their fields were granted to them. They were therefore known as 'copyholders'. Such 'copies' may be called the charters of the peasants.

In the period of the great conflicts between the emperor and his opponents in Italy, and in that of the Hundred Years' War between England and France, the process of the selling away of feudal privileges went on apace, till almost every considerable town had its charter.




A MEDIEVAL TOWN. The City walls of Avila in Spain

Communes. In many of the larger cities during the later periods of the Middle Ages a development of democratic self-government took place, which reminds one strongly of the Greek city-state. The means by which such democracy was established was generally the setting up of a 'commune'—an association of the citizens formed, in defiance of their feudal superiors, with the object of erecting a republican form of government in the city, the regulation being frequently made that no one should be permitted to remain in the city who did not join the commune.

These communes were often forced to fight desperately for their existence, as they were of course hateful to tyrannical feudal overlords. In the struggle the citizens developed a love of freedom and ideals of equality and public spirit, which seem a rebirth of the true Athenian democracy of the age of Pericles. We find the cities of North Italy, for instance, not only forming 'the one bulwark between the Italian middle classes and a particularly lawless form of feudalism', but at times opposing with the most gallant courage any attempt at control from outside. When, in the twelfth century, the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa attempted to codify and increase the rights of the Empire over Italy, and to crush out the spirit of independence which was already strong in the towns, he met with desperate resistance from the communes of Milan and Crema. Both towns were besieged and finally destroyed by the imperial forces; but the influence of their struggle for freedom was seen in the formation of the Lombard League of North Italian cities, which in the great battle of Legnano (1176) utterly defeated the Emperor's army and won from him a large measure of autonomy.

In Flanders also, where by the end of the twelfth century there were forty rich communes dependent chiefly on their skill in manufacturing for foreign markets, the burghers fought a stout battle for liberty against the oppression of their feudal overlord, the Count of Flanders, and the



A STREET SCENE IN THE MIDDLE AGES

The Author presents a book to his Patron, 15th Cent. From
a miniature by Jean Fouquet

aggression of the kings of France. At the battle of Courtrai (1302) they showed the world again that a levy of citizens, inspired by the passion for freedom, could beat a feudal army in the open field.

In France and England the towns rose to power chiefly through their alliance with the king against the feudal nobility ; and their support was of invaluable service in the development of strong national monarchy. In France the communes were eventually recognized as tenants holding their land direct from the king and liable to taxation and military service at his pleasure. This privileged status of the communes, and their alliance with the monarchy, became a standing and salutary menace to the feudal aristocracy. Later, as the monarchy grew stronger and the towns were weakened by faction, many French cities lost their charters and came under the despotic rule of the king, exercised through his royal commissioners. This change was indeed often hailed with relief by the citizens, as ending the perpetual and disastrous party strife from which these communes suffered. In England the Crown was stronger than elsewhere, owing to the masterly and autocratic policy of William the Conqueror, founder of the Norman dynasty in the eleventh century. Her remoteness and isolation also kept England poorer than her neighbours, and hence the towns remained for long comparatively small and backward. True communes were indeed never developed, though merchant guilds and craft guilds were highly organized. But the evolution of Parliament in the thirteenth century brought political importance to the English cities. Their representatives, together with two knights from each shire, were first summoned in 1265, in order that they might grant money through taxation to the rebel governor of England, Earl Simon de Montfort. This procedure was rendered regular and permanent by King Edward I in 1295 : and from that time on the power of the towns increased side by side with that of Parliament.

Thus in many parts of Europe, even during the periods of widespread feudal anarchy, the towns were springing up, becoming centres of trade and wealth, buying their charters from kings and barons, establishing communes, administering justice in their own courts, and laying the foundations of an independent and public-spirited municipal life under the control of their own elected officers. The fiercer the feudal wars became, the more the towns flourished; for the barons needed the more money, and thus were the more ready to grant charters.

Faction in the Towns. But the mediaeval city, and especially the commune, resembled the Greek city-state in its vices as well as in its virtues. Freedom meant party bitterness and faction fighting. The cities were rarely willing to combine for mutual support. They often treacherously joined the common foe—feudal baron or foreign aggressor—in attacking neighbouring cities of which they were jealous. Moreover, as the national monarchies became stronger, the freedom of the towns was gradually undermined.

In Italy the cities followed the example of Greece in another direction; for disunion within the walls gave opportunity for the rise of petty tyrants, whose rule, though at times brilliant and popular, was as autocratic as that of their ancient counterparts. This flood of despotism advanced steadily through the Italian towns, till in the fifteenth century republican institutions remained in Venice alone. Later, Venice herself was to fall under the sway of a close and despotic oligarchy.

Yet, in spite of their faction and their disposition to fall under tyranny, these Italian cities had shown to the world, after the dark ages of barbarism, a practical example of the revival of Greek democracy and Greek autonomy; and this leaven of freedom continued to work unseen. Moreover, the free Italian cities, like Athens in her glory, had been the nurseries of art and literature; and the tyrants in their turn

followed the example of the Greek tyrants in bestowing liberal patronage upon artists and poets and architects. Thus the way was prepared for the wonderful awakening of artistic genius which accompanied the revival of learning in the Renaissance. In this work of preparation the most famous name is that of Dante (1265-1321), the supremely great poet of Florence.

4. *New Forms of Warfare.* Another important cause of the decay of feudalism was the inefficiency of the feudal forms of warfare. In the typical feudal army each great baron brought his own contingent, and equipped and paid it himself. The barons were pledged to serve for a stated period, in England for forty days during the year; and if the prospects of obtaining plunder or of conquering fresh estates for themselves were not sufficiently attractive, the barons were likely summarily to withdraw their contingents as soon as the stipulated period of service was over. This of course led to the ignominious termination of any campaign which the king might have undertaken.

Hence it was the ambition of any strong feudal monarch to obtain from his feudatories money payments instead of military contingents. The barons were generally ready enough to fall in with his wishes in this respect, as the military service due to the king was regarded as an obnoxious burden and a badge of dependence.

The necessity thus incurred by the barons for raising large sums of money helped on the process already described, by which the towns gained their charters and the serfs their leases. With the funds which came in under this system the king hired mercenary troops. Since he was their paymaster, these mercenaries obeyed him much better than had the barons and their retainers; and thus the new armies could be formed into a far more efficient instrument of warfare than was ever possible with the ill-assorted and ill-disciplined feudal array. Hence the power of the kings increased, whilst

that of the barons diminished. The whole process was but a repetition of the similar movement, already mentioned, which took place in India and other lands as the first Aryan invaders settled down.

Later on came great changes in the character of warfare and in the weapons used. We have already seen how the citizen levies of the Lombard League decisively defeated Frederick Barbarossa at the battle of Legnano, and how the men of the Flemish cities slaughtered the feudal army of the King of France at Courtrai. Soon after this last-named battle the hardy mountaineers of Switzerland revolted against their feudal overlords, the Hapsburgs of Austria, who thereupon led a great army into the mountains to chastise the rebels. At Mortgarten (1315),


'the Swiss raised a sudden shout and rolled down heaps of rocks and stones among the crowded ranks. . . . With massy clubs they dashed in pieces the armour of the enemy and dealt their blows and thrusts with long pikes. . . . A slight frost having injured the road, the horses were impeded in all their motions ; many leaped into the lake ; all were startled ; and at last the whole column gave way and fell suddenly back upon the infantry ; and these last, as the nature of the country did not allow them to open their files, were run over by the fugitives and many of them trampled to death.' ¹

It would be hard to over-emphasize the significance of this decisive victory won by peasants, not citizens, against their age-long oppressors, the feudal nobility. Not only did it shake the edifice of feudal tyranny far and wide through Europe, but it marked the birth of genuine liberty for a peasant state. For the Hapsburgs never succeeded in reconquering the league of the Swiss peasants. Seventy years after Mortgarten, at another memorable battle, that of Sempach (1386), the Swiss defeated a second great attempt to overthrow their liberty. In that battle the heroic Arnold of Winkelried opened a pathway for the Swiss spearmen

¹ Quoted in Henderson, *Western Europe*.


into the feudal ranks by gathering as many lances as he could grasp into his own breast.

Another heavy blow was dealt to feudalism in the battle of Bannockburn (1314), where the Scottish peasant spearmen signally defeated the feudal army of Edward II of England.



Longbowman and Crossbowman of the 15th Cent.

Archery. Meanwhile there was being developed a still more effective weapon than the spear, the longbow, by means of which a stalwart and carefully trained peasantry could slaughter the feudal cavalry at will and from a distance. It is said that an expert archer could pierce an oaken door four inches thick, and that his arrows would carry four hundred yards. It soon became evident that in face of such a terrible weapon feudal methods of fighting were doomed. The battle of Crécy (1346) is of great importance, since there the splendid



A MEDIEVAL SIEGE. From a Flemish MS. about 1480 made for Edward IV

feudal army of France was proved to be almost helpless before a far smaller number of English peasants armed with longbows. The same lesson was taught a few years after Crécy, at Poitiers (1356), where, after another frightful slaughter of feudal nobility by English archer peasants, the King of France himself, together with large numbers of his barons, was taken prisoner by the English. Later, at Agincourt (1415), the French feudal army, thirty thousand strong, suffered at the hands of five thousand English a still more crushing and disgraceful defeat. It was a rainy day and the ground was soft. The heavily armoured knights stuck fast in the mud. There they were ignominiously shot down, knocked on the head, or captured. More than eight thousand Frenchmen were killed and fifteen hundred knights and nobles were taken prisoners.

It was now abundantly clear to Europe that the feudal nobility was no match on the field of battle for those very peasants whom they despised and oppressed on their estates. This lesson was a little later driven home with increased definiteness by the employment of gunpowder in warfare and by the development of trained armies equipped with firearms. When proud barons and famous knights, the all but absolute rulers of great estates and the heirs of a dozen generations of aristocratic privilege, could be basely destroyed from far away by arrow or musket-ball discharged by the meanest of serfs, the old feudal power was irrevocably doomed.

In the case of England the aristocracy assisted in its own extinction by the murderous Wars of the Roses, which occupied part of the latter half of the fifteenth century. In these wars so many nobles were killed, and the survivors so seriously weakened in power and wealth, that a strong national monarchy was established without difficulty under the great Tudor dynasty.

In France the wars of religion during the sixteenth century had much the same effect ; but in that country the aristocracy

retained far more power over the peasantry than was the case in England.

5. *Monarchy.* The genuinely feudal monarch, like his predecessor in the nomadic tribe, had been chosen and counselled, and to a considerable degree controlled, by his 'peers'—those heads of the great families and personal companions of the King, in the old days of migration and invasion, who had been rewarded with the gift of great estates when the tribe settled down upon its conquered territory.

Where, as was the case to a great extent in England, the estates of these great nobles were scattered widely in small divisions over the conquered country, it was difficult for any one baron to set himself up as an independent potentate in opposition to the King.

Later, the development of mercenary armies and the alliance of the King with the common people in opposition to the nobility, still further strengthened the hands of the monarchy. The mass of the population were not slow to realize that 'good government was only another name for a public-spirited and powerful monarchy': that the King was their friend, and that the hereditary aristocracy, with its oppressive feudal rights, was their enemy. A strong king not only curbed the riotous and violent selfishness of the barons, but in place of the arbitrary and chaotic jurisdiction of the feudal courts imposed a uniform system of law and justice, administered through its own officers, sheriffs, and itinerant justices, as they were called in England. 'The King existed to do justice, to secure every man in the possession of his own, to apply the law without respect of persons.'

In addition to his officers of law and police, the medieval monarch also established a central department of finance. From these two roots—the administration of justice and of revenue—developed the machinery of modern executive government.


In central and eastern Europe the principle of elective

monarchy persisted, particularly in the case of the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire and in that of the kings of Poland ; thus in Germany and beyond it the power of the central monarchy remained comparatively weak, and that of the feudal aristocracy strong. But in the west it was quickly realized by king and people that a rule of hereditary succession was essential, since the dangers of disputed election, of foreign interference with the electors, and of the opportunity for anarchy presented by the interval between the death of one ruler and the choice of his successor, rendered the elective system gravely inefficient. The aristocracy, on the other hand, was generally eager to continue or re-establish the elective system, since it placed so much more power and dignity in their own hands.

By the end of the Middle Ages, in spite of determined baronial opposition, hereditary monarchy, in alliance with the common people, had given a strong central government to France, England, and Spain. In Germany, on the other hand, there were over three hundred semi-independent feudal dominions, whose princes were only very partially under the control of their elected Emperor. In Poland the nobility was all-powerful. Italy was still hopelessly divided, and largely under the control of foreign potentates.

6. *Parliament.* It must not be supposed that the progress towards strong monarchy was uniform, even in the countries of western Europe. There were periods when the aristocracy, seizing the chance of a king's weakness or of a break in the hereditary succession, were for a time completely in the ascendant. But they quarrelled amongst themselves, so that the monarchy, by the help of the citizens and of the common people, always succeeded in regaining its position of pre-dominance. A very important factor in the struggle between monarchy and aristocracy was the rise of parliaments. These assemblies were in the direct line of descent from the gatherings of the primitive Aryan tribe. To employ the terms

which came into use in England, there was on the one hand the House of Lords, corresponding to the Council of Elders which had advised the King. On the other hand there was the



Parliament of Edward I

House of Commons, corresponding to the assembly of the whole people summoned by the King and Elders to decide some point of importance to the whole community. For centuries, during the worst period of feudalism, popular

assemblies had been in abeyance ; but in England the principle had been revived, as we have seen, by Earl Simon de Montfort and King Edward I for the purpose of raising money. In France the Third Estate, as the Commons were called, were first summoned by King Philip IV, in 1302, to support him in a contest with the Papacy.

In England the ground had been prepared for the development and power of Parliament by the skill which the kings had already shown in attracting the lesser landowners and the chief citizens to take a share in the administration of law and finance. As jurymen, assessors of taxes, and honorary magistrates they had already learnt, or were in the process of learning, much of the business of government, and had become quick to detect and correct any infringement of justice on the part either of the barons or of the royal officials. Hence, by the time when Parliament came into regular existence, there was already growing up a strong middle class, enlightened and experienced in the work of government. The history of numerous countries has shown that parliamentary institutions, to be successful, depend mainly upon the existence of such a middle class, without which these institutions are liable to develop either on the one hand into an oligarchy of wealth and birth, or on the other hand into mob-terrorism, probably followed by military autocracy.

In France, where the nobility was far stronger than in England, and the monarchy had not so successfully attempted to delegate some of its functions of government, the effort to set up an assembly competent to tax the nation failed precisely because no such enlightened and experienced middle class was available to help in the work. Yet the alliance between the French monarchy and the Commons (called the Third Estate), which frequently took the form of royal assistance given to vassals and communes in revolt against their feudal superiors, was of considerable effect in weakening the power of the overweening aristocracy.

The attempts of the kings to set up assemblies which should be recognized as competent to tax the whole nation, and by the help of such assemblies to reduce the power of the barons, depended for their success not only upon the growth of a middle class, but also upon the representative character of the assemblies thus summoned. For at last there had been discovered a method of avoiding the mistake which fettered all ancient democracy—the mistake of admitting every citizen to a place in the governing assembly. In the ancient world, as we have seen, such ‘direct democracy’ had tended to mean government by the idle and pauperized mob; and this had spelt the doom of democracy itself. But an alternative system was gradually evolved in England. This system of representation, on which Parliament depends, began in small things—in connexion with law courts and tax assessment, and also in the monastic orders. A village or township sent representatives to the county court, and from Edward I’s reign (1272–1307) the county court sent its representatives to Parliament. Then the representatives of counties and towns became the House of Commons, and in time began to debate and vote by themselves, without nobles being present to overawe them.

By this system of representation the evils of direct democracy were avoided. The rule of a parliament was not the mob rule of a huge and tumultuous assembly, with its fickle changes, its appeals to base motives and passions, its embittered faction spirit. Yet, on the other hand, government could still be democratic and popular, because the men sitting in Parliament and deciding there how the country should be taxed or what new laws should be made were the chosen representatives of the people, accountable to those who had chosen them, and competent both to speak for them and to communicate to them, when they went back home, the will of the government.

The Growth of the Power of Parliament. At first to be

a member of Parliament was regarded as anything but an honour and privilege. The King's summons to a city or a shire that they should appoint representatives was thoroughly unwelcome, it being regarded as a command given to the people that they should help in their own spoliation at the hands of the royal tax-gatherers. But the Commons were not slow to realize that 'he who pays the piper calls the tune'. They claimed with success increasingly wide control over the manner in which the King spent the money that they gave him. The House of Lords—the old feudal Council of the barons—had in 1215 shown itself strong enough to force from King John a great charter embodying wide-reaching concessions in the interests of its own order, concessions which it misused in the time of that weak King's still weaker successor, but which were afterwards to be claimed by the Commons as the foundation of all English liberty. Yet, in spite of its prestige and its feudal grandeur, the House of Lords found itself at first supplemented, then thwarted, and finally supplanted by the Commons as the chief instrument of government. In this as in other directions the Commons relied upon their sovereign weapon—the control of taxation.

By the middle of the fourteenth century the English King was forced, through the expensive wars he was carrying on with France, to summon Parliament every year. He frequently asked its advice upon the most important questions of policy, and was frequently also forced to accede to its requests for redress of grievances in various departments of government. Thus encouraged, the Commons in 1376 attacked the mismanagement of the French war, and even impeached (accused of treason before the Lords) the actual ministers of the King. Shortly afterwards the Commons gained the right of auditing the King's accounts, in order that they might see that the money which they granted was properly expended upon the objects for which it had been voted. By the beginning of the fifteenth century Parlia-



INTERIOR OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS IN 1742

ment was powerful enough to depose a king and to assign the crown to another.

With the anarchy of the Wars of the Roses the power of Parliament began to wane, and upon their close the one desire of England was for a firm central rule, which men felt was to be found in a strong monarchy, as the only safeguard against a renewal of feudal disorder. Thus during the sixteenth century Parliament was the willing and loyal servant of the great Tudor dynasty, many of whose methods were exceedingly autocratic. But men remembered the claims which Parliament once had made. When in the seventeenth century the degeneration of the monarchy under the Stuarts called for a reassertion of popular rights, the Commons were ready to take once more their ancient place as the champions of liberty.

Thus with the growth of Parliament we see the growth of a spirit of freedom and order that supports the Crown in its struggle for central control against feudal anarchy, and is of the greatest service in curbing the powers of the nobility. In England, though not elsewhere, the medieval Parliament even succeeds in establishing a very large measure of control over the Crown itself, and thus becomes a noteworthy agency for the maintenance of popular liberty. 'Before Parliament had been in existence for two centuries it had deposed five kings and conferred a legal title upon three new dynasties: it had indicated to posterity the lines upon which an absolutism could be fought and ruined without civil war: and it had proved that the representative element in the constitution might overrule both monarchy and aristocracy.'¹

Summary. At the beginning of the medieval period Europe was swamped under savage migrating tribes—tribes propelled westwards by pressure from China. The Church, under the guidance of the Papacy, laboured hard at the task of taming these barbarians, teaching them an elementary

¹ Davis, *Mediaeval Europe*, p. 180.

Christian morality, demonstrating to them the grandeur of the idea of universal orderly rule, preserving safe but forgotten through long ages of darkness the records of ancient greatness and freedom, and founding universities in which at last those records were to be studied once more.

The conquering barbarians built up a new social and political system, simple and easily worked, and with an ideal in it of service and duty to be performed by every man, but in the hands of a greedy and selfish aristocracy liable to degenerate into unbridled and lawless aggression, whereby the poor man was oppressed, and society and the state torn violently to pieces.

In a conflict which from first to last extended over a thousand years this feudalism was combated and finally conquered by a variety of forces. Amongst these forces, though not one of the strongest or most efficient of them, was the Holy Roman Empire—a vain effort to bring back into the world the Roman universal dominion. Another force, the Papacy, failed in the same effort for unification, in spite of the temporary predominance of a few great Popes; for it found itself opposed by the growing power of national feeling, kings and peoples rebelling at the autocratic claims of the Roman bishop. A far stronger force in the overthrow of aristocratic supremacy was the growth of the towns, a growth dependent upon trading wealth, and unconsciously encouraged by the nobles themselves, who sold away their feudal rights to the citizens. Again, the citizens and peasants, armed with their spears and bows, came in time to beat the feudal nobility at its own perennial occupation—warfare. Finally, the growth of strong monarchies, and their alliance with the common people meeting in representative assemblies, put an end to the supremacy of the aristocracy, which assisted in its own ruin by internecine civil wars.

Thus the Middle Ages are a period of conflict, in which feudalism is gradually worsted by the kings and the people.



VII

Nationalism

WHEN we look back upon the past four and a half centuries, which are generally regarded as forming the modern period of European history, we find the same forces engaged as came to the fore in the medieval struggle against feudalism. But the influence of these forces is overshadowed by a new and vastly more powerful force, whose beginning we have already noticed amongst the Jews. This force, which was exerting an ever-increasing influence during the latter part of the Middle Ages, is nationalism. If the Middle Ages were the epoch of feudal conflicts and of the conflict of civilization with feudalism, then the modern period is the epoch of national conflicts and of the conflict of civilization with nationalism.

The Rise of Nationalism. We have already briefly dealt with the consolidation of the power of monarchy in alliance with popular assemblies. This consolidation, which took place not only in England and France, but also in Spain, was rendered possible largely by the national feeling aroused in a series of great wars carried on between England and France on the one hand, and between Spain and her Moslem conquerors on the other. These wars were not mere feudal combats between rival aristocracies. The common people shared fiercely in them; and a strong feeling of common interest and national patriotism sprang up, whilst the kings became popular and powerful largely because they were national leaders against the national foe.

France was possibly the first country of Europe in which genuine nationality developed. In A. D. 1214 the King of England, the Emperor of Germany, and the Count of Flanders invaded France, and were decisively beaten by King Philip and his army at the great battle of Bouvines. This battle may be taken as roughly marking the beginning of French nationalism. Exactly a hundred years later Scotch nationalism may be said to have been one of the factors responsible for the triumph of King Robert the Bruce over the English at Bannockburn. The Scottish wars on the one hand, and on the other the great victories of Crécy and Poitiers in the Hundred Years' War against France, increased a feeling of nationalism which was already present in England, though its development was later to be interrupted by the Wars of the Roses.

The French monarchy fell to a low level of incompetence during the earlier part of the Hundred Years' War (1338-1453). Feudal anarchy was rampant; the peasantry were bitterly oppressed; large parts of the country were overrun by the English. But the national cause was restored, and the French spirit raised to an ardent flame of patriotism, by the heroic career of the maiden warrior, Joan of Arc, in whom French nationalism reached its highest and noblest expression (1429-31). She was basely deserted by the King to whom she had given back the leadership of the French nation, and she suffered a terrible death; but her work had been well done. The national soul had been effectually awakened, and the national foe was at last driven headlong from the soil of France.

The long wars of the Spaniards against the Moors were not brought to an end till the conquest of Granada at the end of the fifteenth century, by which time a strong national monarchy had thoroughly unified and consolidated Spain, and had resolutely beaten down all opposition, whether of nobility or of assemblies or of local independence. Until the latter half of the sixteenth century Spain remained a

stronger and more effectively organized nation than either France or England.

From Germany, efforts were made, as we have seen, by a line of great emperors to achieve a thorough conquest of Italy. These efforts were defeated, partly by the determined resistance of the Italian city-states and of the Papacy, partly in consequence of the assaults made upon eastern Europe by Mongols and Turks, and partly through the strength of feudalism in Germany itself. The failure of the emperors in Italy vastly delayed the progress towards nationhood of both countries. The forces of division were so strengthened that each region became the battle-ground of rapacious foreign invaders. Italy was overrun and parcelled out by France, by Spain, and by Austria.¹ Germany was torn in pieces by Sweden, Denmark, France, and Austria. Both countries had to wait till the nineteenth century before a national monarchy became strong enough to bring about national unification.

National Autocracy. The beginnings of nationalism, as a force in European history, are thus to be sought far back in the Middle Ages. By some historians they are indeed placed still farther back, in the ninth and tenth centuries, when the consolidation of England into one state was begun under King Egbert (802-39), and continued under King Alfred (871-901), whilst France and Germany became strong and separate states under Hugh Capet (987-96) and Henry the Fowler (919-36).

¹ Austria formed part of the Empire and became the centre of the power of the Emperor after 1648. This date marks the close of the Thirty Years' War, during which foreign nations overran and devastated Germany at will. After that time the Hapsburgs, who held the imperial authority, being yet further weakened in Germany as a whole, were driven to consolidate and extend their power in and around Austria itself, where they were hereditary rulers. The consequent extension of Austrian power was chiefly westwards into Italy and south-eastwards into lands that had been held by the Turks.


Feudalism was everywhere a determined foe to national unity. The barons fought every advance towards strong monarchy, under which alone such unity could be attained, and clung with obstinacy to every privilege which tended to make for their own independence. But the tide of national autocracy was not to be stayed, at any rate in western Europe. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, France, England, and Spain were true nations, ruled autocratically by strong and brilliant monarchs. Their kings were not only autocrats, but popular autocrats, for they embodied and expressed the will of the people for national glory, adventure and independence. Soon afterwards the great Emperor Charles V made a supreme effort against the feudal anarchy which cursed and crippled his empire. He endeavoured to establish a strong central control in Germany, concentrated in his own hands, and backed if needful by Spanish garrisons, for he was also King of Spain. His efforts were foredoomed to failure. The forces of feudalism, of religious disunion, and of hatred for his Spaniards were too strong for him.

In A. D. 1532 the Italian writer and statesman Machiavelli published his famous book *The Prince*, in which he expressed the idea of an autocracy so supreme as to place the interests of the state, focused in an absolute ruler, far above all considerations of religion or morality. Machiavelli's ideas summed up the spirit of his time—a spirit which in many of its features persisted through the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and well into the nineteenth.

During this protracted period popular assemblies in most of the countries of Europe either lost their power and fell out of use, or became the subservient instruments of the monarch's personal will. The Continent was torn by fierce international wars, undertaken largely for dynastic reasons, though considerations of religion and of trade also played a great part in bringing them about.

The Influence of Religion and Trade on the Growth of

Nationalism. With regard to religion, when, early in the sixteenth century, the Roman Church was rent asunder by the Protestant Reformation, Spain remained fanatically Catholic, England became moderately Protestant (the English sovereign becoming head of the national Church instead of the Pope), and France after fierce civil wars decided to remain moderately Catholic.¹ Germany was divided between Catholicism in the south and a type of Protes-



The Potosí Gold Mines in Bolivia
A woodcut of 1555

tantism in the north which made the local prince the head of religion in his state, and thus carried yet farther the process of German disintegration. Hence the result of the Reformation was the adding of religious dissension to the other forces which divided nation from nation.

With regard to trade, the discovery of America and of the sea-routes to the East, at the end of the fifteenth century, led to an enormous development of oceanic commerce. This in its turn led to fierce national rivalries, stimulated both by the greed for gain and by the spirit of adventure which spurred on the bold sailors and merchants of that age. The Portuguese, and later the Dutch, attempted to keep in their own hands the new trade with the East, whilst the Spaniards, supported by the Pope, claimed an exclusive right to the exploitation of the rich American continents and islands, with the single exception of Brazil, which went to the Portuguese. The national conflict between Spain and England

¹ But here again the great autocrats Louis XIV and Napoleon made themselves to all intents and purposes independent of the Pope, and could even dictate to him what he should do.

C A R O L I N A.

The Company for *Royal Mines*, Copper and other Works in *Cumberland*, &c. having a Grant from the *Lords Proprietors* of the Province of *Carolina* in America of all the *Mines Royal* and other Mines with any subterranean Treasure that shall be discovered in the said Province.

These are to give notice, That any Person well understanding *Mines*, *Minerals*, &c. and the art of mining, may apply themselves to the Committee appointed for managing the same; sitting at *Mrs. Vernon's* Coffee-house in *Bartholomew-Lane* behind the *Royal Exchange* every *Tuesday* at four a Clock in the Afternoon: And if desirous to serve the said Company in *Carolina* aforesaid, may have encouraging Proposals made them for the same.

That there are *Mines* of extraordinary value in *America* we need no other Evidence than the *Treasure Europe* now possesseth; which is supplied by a Yearly Import of *Boloin* by the *Spaniards*,

Also that there are *Mines* of equal Value with those possessed by the *Spaniards* in the vast and promising *Apalarbean* Mountains which lie in *Carolina*, for 700 Miles in length and are 20 or 30 Miles over, we need not doubt, since they lie in the same degree of Latitude with *Mexico*, &c. and are every much noted by Writers for the great Treasure they possess; particularly *John de laet*, of *Antwerp*, Anno 1633 in his History of the *West-Indies*; which is confirmed by the unanimous report of the *Indians*, as well as those that have been Eye-witnesses thereof who have brought from thence divers *Minerals* of good value even from the very surface.

The Country is very pleasant, and the most Southerly of all our *English* Settlement on the Continent, which gives it Preference in many respects to all others, it lying in the same Latitude with *Barmoodoes* and the Land of *Canaan*, (a Climate so much celebrated) and plentiful in Provision both for Sustenance and Exportation; Beef being about 10 s. the Hundred. Pork 14 s. also Wheat, Rice and most other Products of *England* abound, that Trade and Settlement much increasing, many Ships going thither this Year with some hundreds of Passengers.

This Company is printed in my Account of Actions by the Name of the *Carolina* and *Cumberland Royal Mines*.

THE LURE OF GOLD. English exploitation of gold in
North America.

Advertisement from Houghton's Collection, Nov. 1649

which marked the latter part of the sixteenth century was largely caused by the English infringements of this Spanish monopoly in America, though religious differences also had considerable influence in bringing the two nations into opposition. In the seventeenth century the wars between the Dutch and English, both Protestant nations, were



LOUIS XIV

also caused by trade questions and commercial jealousies. The conflicts of France and England between 1701 and 1763 may be traced largely to the same reason. Again, commercial expansion, and the desire to capture and control distant markets, were important factors in bringing about the colonial enterprises and conflicts of various European powers in the nineteenth century, and finally in leading up to the Great War of 1914-1918.

Benevolent Despotism. Autocracy remained powerful in Europe so long as it could continue to embody and express the will of a whole people for national efficiency and expansion: so long, that is, as it remained genuinely popular. Thus Louis XIV, the great autocrat of France, could govern despotically because he carried his country for a time to the pinnacle of greatness and glory, making French culture on the one hand, and French armies on the other, the pattern of the whole continent. Napoleon, again, could govern despotically for the same reason. He was the living

embodiment of a great nation's passion for glory and power. His government was, moreover, thoroughly efficient and business-like. The same is true of other great autocrats, Peter the Great of Russia (1689-1725), Frederick the Great of Prussia (1740-86), and (to a lesser degree) Joseph II of Austria (1765-90). We may perhaps add Oliver Cromwell of England to the list.

These autocrats were men of strong character and enlighten-



OLIVER CROMWELL



NAPOLEON

ment, men of determination and patience and courage, men who bent their whole energies to the task of ruling their peoples according to the principles of efficiency and progress. The power of nobles was ruthlessly curbed. Trade and manufacture were encouraged. Systems of education were set up. National finances were carefully regulated, and official corruption checked. Colonies were founded. Laws were codified. Great public works were constructed, cities built, canals dug, marshes drained. Such 'benevolent despots' built up the power of their respective nations, not only by successful foreign warfare, but by every type of wise internal legislation. But they were despots. Their power depended in the last resort upon great armies—armies which had to be kept contented and busy by foreign aggression. Representative


assemblies fell for the most part into entire oblivion. In some countries such assemblies were actively repressed. In others half-hearted attempts were made to allow them a share in the work of government ; but as soon as the assembly in question showed a will of its own, it was dissolved. This was the way of Cromwell.

The age of the benevolent despot was an age of continual warfare, not only because national armies had to be satisfied in their thirst for conquest and glory, but also because such conflict offered the most obvious outlet for the personal ambitions of the rulers and the best method of rallying the popular will to the support of those ambitions, which were often connected with such individual and dynastic matters as inheritances, or marriage-settlements, or the personal resentments or friendships of the autocrats themselves.

Democratic Nationalism. But the peoples of Europe could not for ever be ruled in this way. As education spread, as trade expanded, as riches increased, as science discovered new means of controlling nature and of obtaining from her fresh stores of wealth and power, the desire for freedom manifested itself more deeply. As long as the despots were really benevolent and really efficient the peoples uneasily consented to be improved from above. But reforms so imposed are accepted with far more hesitation, and are far less able to effect genuine changes in the national character, than reforms which a people imposes upon itself. In their reforming zeal the autocrats tended to be tactless and high-handed, giving needless offence to sections of the community which it was highly desirable for them to conciliate, if their changes were to be permanent. Above all, the benevolent despot could not reign for ever. When he died the hereditary rule of succession, which had by this time been adopted everywhere in Europe, except in Poland and the Empire, might bring to the throne a despot who was not benevolent, but merely despotic, or weak and frivolous and a disgrace

to his nation. Thus the magnificent Louis XIV was succeeded by the contemptible Louis XV.

In short, autocracy ceased in time to be popular. The change was fatal to it. A series of great thinkers, of whom Rousseau was the most eloquent and influential, accustomed Europe to the idea of reapplying the ancient principles of freedom. The revolt of the American colonies from England, and the establishment of the democratic United States, gave a practical demonstration of how freedom might be actually attained. Then, in a series of revolutions, extending from 1789 to 1918, autocracy was overthrown. In some countries, for example France, it was several times re-established and overthrown again. Democracy was everywhere set up, and was founded firmly on representative assemblies elected by the people.



ROUSSEAU

But democracy was as narrowly nationalistic as autocracy had been. We have noticed already the tendency of ancient democracies towards imperialism. In modern Europe also the freed peoples seemed to desire nothing so much as the opportunity to rule other peoples. Revolutionary France set forth, first to spread the fiery doctrines of her revolution by force of arms, and afterwards to conquer Europe for her own imperial glory. Later, when Hungary won her freedom from Austrian tyranny, she adopted a policy of

rigorous repression towards the national aspirations of her own subject peoples.

More recent events are too new for political judgements, but enough has been said to show that the change from autocracy to democracy has been little successful in checking the spirit of aggressive nationalism.

The Effects of Nationalism. From many points of view the results of nationalism have been disastrous. Constant international conflicts have taken place—conflicts on an increasing scale in size, cost, and loss of life. In our own time it has become plain that national warfare, backed as it now is by all the resources of a skilful and ingenious scientific spirit, threatens to destroy civilization outright. The German War, with its various consequences, has already cost some twenty million lives, and its full effects in the dislocation of trade and industry, and in the impoverishment and starvation of mankind, have not yet been felt.

Thus in the interests of humanity it is needful that the old type of nationalism should end—the nationalism, that is, which means that the peoples of the world confront each other organized in armies, equipped with terrifically destructive weapons, supported by the man-power and money-power of the state, prepared at a moment's notice to engage (perhaps for the flimsiest reasons) in murderous conflict, during which everything—including the possibility of existence for unborn generations—is sacrificed in order to obtain victory against the state which is for the moment the 'national foe'.

We have seen how, in the Middle Ages, the cause of civilization demanded the curbing of feudalism. So also, ~~but~~ to a greater degree, it is necessary to-day to the ~~very~~ existence of civilization that nationalism should be curbed.

The problem of rightly restraining nationalism demands for its solution that the loyalty and self-sacrificing service

of men should be extended to an object far beyond the nation. 'Patriotism is not enough.'¹ We must have a world-loyalty and a world-service. If men can serve freely and gladly nothing beyond the nation, it is to be feared that terrific disaster must result; for nations will continue to contend with other nations, in warfare which science will soon make so deadly as to involve the wholesale destruction of non-combatants as well as combatants. Such warfare will continue to draw in other nations till the whole world is involved in self-annihilation; for mankind is so closely knit together that it is impossible, as was amply proved in the Great War, for any considerable nation long to remain neutral.

But if, on the other hand, the spirit of loyalty and of freely rendered service can be extended beyond national patriotism to world patriotism: if the fighting instinct of mankind can be turned against disease and poverty, inequality and injustice, wherever they are found, then there is hope, not only that the world may be saved from destruction, but that the safety and happiness and freedom of humanity may be infinitely and gloriously extended.

The Problem before the Modern World. The problem before the world during the modern period of history has thus been that of substituting, for a narrow and aggressive national patriotism, wider loyalties directed towards ever larger aggregations of mankind inhabiting broader and broader areas of the earth.

As we have already noticed, this problem is to be solved neither by internal democracy nor by freedom from the control of foreign imperialism. History indeed shows that, in modern Europe as in ancient Greece, the obtaining of free institutions and of autonomy tends to make a people the more eager to restrict the freedom of other peoples. Yet,

¹ The dying words of Nurse Cavell, herself a strongly patriotic Englishwoman, who fell a victim to nationalism in the Great War.

while this is so, it is plain that a state which is governed by the autocratic will of one man or of a military class will never be a safe neighbour in a true commonwealth of free and civilized nations. The temptations are too strong for the autocrat or the military class to consolidate their power through external aggression. It is obvious also that in a commonwealth of civilized nations, the presence of states which are under the control of other states will be impossible. For the existence of an imperialistic nationalism, which allows dominance and exploitation of weaker peoples by stronger, is in itself evidence that aggressive nationalism is not yet checked and free civilization not yet achieved.

Hence the problem to be solved is that of uniting democratic and autonomous states in some bond which shall prevent the excesses of aggressive and imperialistic nationalism.

The Benefits of Nationalism. In spite of its dangers and tragedies, nationalism has conferred many benefits upon mankind. It has, for instance, been the main factor in bringing back into the modern world the Greek ideal of autonomy—of the right of a little people to self-determination, and of the fundamental injustice of all imperial domination and exploitation. With this we shall deal later. Nationalism has also served as a powerful stimulus to art and literature, providing countless themes, and a never-failing fountain of inspiration, to poets and orators and painters. It has contributed to the spreading of education and to the extension all over the world of the material benefits of modern culture (for instance, railways and telegraphs, and higher standards of life); for a healthy rivalry has existed amongst the nations for efficiency in such respects. It has led to innumerable acts of gallant self-sacrifice, whereby multitudes of brave men have laid down their lives for their nation. It has given rise to a process under which the instincts and activities of the individual citizen have been

more and more thoroughly subordinated to the interests of the state.

Yet, in spite of these and many other benefits, the Great War has made it plain that, unless national loyalty can be widened, and patriotism extended to include all mankind, nationalism threatens sooner or later utterly to destroy civilization.

What then are the forces which have been employed in the past, and may perhaps be of use in the future, for the purpose of checking the dangers of this anarchic nationalism, and of widening the loyalties of mankind?

The Curbing of Nationalism. 1. *The Balance of Power.* The idea of the Balance of Power probably originated in Italy, and spread thence through Europe early in the sixteenth century. Cardinal Wolsey, the skilful and ambitious minister of the English autocrat Henry VIII (1509-47), is held by many historians to have guided England's foreign relations on this principle. In his time France was fighting the Emperor Charles V, who was also the King of Spain, with the object of securing control over Italy. England had no direct interest in the Italian question, but by an adroit alternation of alliances, first with Spain, then with France, then with Spain again, and finally with France again, Wolsey tried to make England a factor of importance in the wars, and brought it about that his master was treated as the equal and rival of the great rulers of the two continental powers, because neither side could afford to offend one who might be powerful either as an opponent or as an ally. By Henry's fickleness and Wolsey's skilful diplomacy a balance was roughly preserved between the combatants, and neither side became so powerful as to be able to disregard the King of England and his minister.

This singular, and somewhat undignified, policy was continued under different circumstances by Queen Elizabeth with regard to her own marriage. Both France and Spain

were eager to secure for some prominent member of their royal families the hand of the English queen, and thereby to obtain the alliance of England; for as things went in those days of autocracy it was regarded as natural and right that a whole nation should be given away, or plunged into war, by some family event in the life of its ruler. By her masterly indecision, and her continued inability to choose between various suitors, Elizabeth kept both France and Spain polite and friendly for many years.

Finally, when Spain, by her cruel oppression of her Protestant subjects in the Netherlands, and by her selfish and tyrannical exploitation of her American possessions, had become a manifest and threatening peril to the rest of the world, Elizabeth committed herself to the great conflict which ended in the defeat of the Spanish Armada. Thereby the balance of power, which had been endangered by the predominance of Spain, was redressed by England, to the lasting benefit of all Europe.

During the latter part of the seventeenth century France took the position of menacing predominance which had once been held by Spain. Consequently England and Holland, under the enlightened and determined leadership of William of Orange (William III of England), undertook two great wars in order to redress the balance of power which was thus threatened.

During the eighteenth century the idea of the balance became a recognized and fundamental principle of European statesmanship. The personal peculiarities and tortuous policies of the autocrats of the time rendered the distribution of power very variable. Hence the balance remained precarious, and a number of great European wars were the result. Of these the most important were the Seven Years' War (1756-63), in which Britain and Prussia were allied against France, Austria, and Russia: and the struggle against revolutionary and Napoleonic France, which extended



Napoleon helps himself to Europe. While Pitt holds the sea for England. Gillray's cartoon of 1805

from 1792 to 1815. Here again England took a most important part in withstanding the French aggression, and thus in ultimately redressing the balance.

Later in the nineteenth century, the same policy led to the Crimean War against the growing predominance of Russia.

Finally, in the twentieth century, the ambition of Germany led to the greatest of all wars, fought in order that the balance might be once more preserved, and Europe saved from the aggressive arrogance of German nationalism.

Thus for four centuries the consistent policy of England, and to a great extent of other European powers, has been to oppose any single nation which for the time being has threatened, by undue dominance or aggressiveness, to become so powerful as to subjugate the other nations of Europe. By this means a certain amount of restraint has been brought to bear upon the worst elements of national selfishness.

But the whole conception of a balance of power is in its very nature uncertain and precarious. Amidst the thousand factors which make for the weakening and strengthening of nations, and above all in face of the innumerable intrigues and jealousies and disputes which permanently exist between the chief European powers, it has proved an impossible task to maintain for long the delicate equipoise that shall prevent the undue predominance of any one state. Progress in wealth and scientific invention, or in unity and efficiency of government : modifications of constitution, towards either autocracy or democracy (both liable to be bellicose) : changes in the condition of neighbouring states, or in their method of government : all these and many other forces have proved liable at any moment to upset the balance, to bring one nation into undue predominance, and thus to plunge Europe into war. Again, the policy of the balance demands a constant trimming and shifting of alliances in preparation for possible conflict ; and the existence of such alliances means in its turn that each member of an alliance is bound, by its obligations to

its allies, to maintain to the fullest possible extent its military and naval resources. Thus the nations of the Continent have been organized into vast armed camps. They have confronted each other across heavily fortified frontiers. Year by year they have been forced to devote more of their manpower and money-power to the maintenance of huge conscript armies and of highly scientific and expensive navies.

Thus the policy of the balance has at times accentuated rather than restrained the evils of anarchic nationalism. The best that can be said for that policy is that it provides a clumsy, inefficient, costly and bloody method of righting the equilibrium when once it has been upset.

2. *Coalitions.* The great alliances which have arisen from time to time as the result of the attempt to maintain the policy of the balance are worthy of some further mention. Such alliances, or coalitions, became of great importance by the latter part of the seventeenth century, when they were repeatedly formed, chiefly by the indefatigable energy of William of Orange, in order to check the ambitions of Louis XIV of France. William had the greatest difficulty in holding his coalitions together; but his policy bore fruit after his death in the great War of the Spanish Succession (1701-13), in which England, Holland, and Austria combined to oppose the aggression of Louis. But here, too, Marlborough, the brilliant diplomatist-general of England, had the greatest difficulty in maintaining the unity of his allies.

During the eighteenth century coalitions were formed against Prussia, which was developing aggressive tendencies under Frederick the Great. At the end of the century the great English statesman, William Pitt, was mainly responsible for the coalitions which fought the French Republic and Napoleon. After the final suppression of Napoleonic France, an alliance was formed by the Emperors of Austria and Russia and the King of Prussia, and was joined also by the restored King of France and other monarchs. Its purpose was ostensibly that

of securing the peace of Europe. But it was aimed quite as much at the suppression of democracy and the preservation of autocracy as at the restraining of aggression on the part of arrogant nations and their rulers. Hence its power was

gradually undermined by the spread of liberal ideas.

In the Crimean War, Russia was opposed by a coalition of French, English, Turks, and North Italians.

Finally, in the recent Great War, all the chief nations of the world and many of the smaller were united in opposing the bid for world domination made by Germany in conjunction with her allies, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey.



COALITION. *Punch's* cartoon of the Crimean War¹

All such coalitions suffer, of course, from the defects of the policy of balance. They have little power to prevent the excesses of nationalism, and can exercise that power, as a rule, only by forcible intervention, at a fearful cost of blood and treasure. Moreover, such coalitions are difficult to control and to hold together. There is a tendency for the allies to make peace separately, whenever it suits their convenience to do so,


¹ By permission of the Proprietors of *Punch*.

thus leaving their friends in the lurch. Again, the strong united command in the aggressor-nation gives it a great advantage in military operations. Lastly, the members of the coalition, if it is victorious, are liable to quarrel over the spoil.

3. *Treaties.* Another attempt to curb the evils of aggressive nationalism is to be seen in the series of great European treaties which have been devised from time to time in order to adjust the situation after a war, and to prevent future conflict. The first all-European treaty was that of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years' War in 1648. All the chief powers of Europe (except England) and a number of lesser states were parties to it. It gave the German princes a still larger measure of independence than they had enjoyed before, by permitting them to make war and peace without consulting the Emperor. It strengthened the position of France, Sweden, and Brandenburg (Prussia). Above all it gave formal recognition to the nationhood of Switzerland and Holland, which had successfully revolted against the imperialism of Austria in the one case and of Spain in the other.

Several important treaties were made after the great wars against Louis XIV. The last of these, the Treaty of Utrecht, in spite of Marlborough's brilliant victories in the war, was turned into something not unlike a triumph for Louis by that astute monarch's skill in taking advantage of the weaknesses and divisions in the great coalition opposed to him. For Louis gained the crown and most of the empire of Spain for his own family. The German Emperor, who after 1648 had become in effect the Austrian Emperor, obtained great accessions of territory in Italy and the Netherlands—territory gained, however, from Spain, not from France. By the same treaty Prussia became a kingdom, and by the gift of Sicily, Savoy was started on the career of expansion which a century and a half later was to make it the nucleus of a united Kingdom of Italy.

During the rest of the eighteenth century there were three all-European treaties. Those concluding the War of the Austrian Succession (1748) and the Seven Years' War (1763) mark the rise of Prussia as a greedy and aggressive power, the inability of Europe to prevent that rise, and the steady growth of the colonial dominions of England. That at the




THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA

end of the American War (1783) gave its independence to the United States.

At the conclusion of the Napoleonic wars the Congress of Vienna (1814-15) endeavoured to construct permanent peace after the exhaustion and suffering of the last twenty-three years. In some directions its work was satisfactory. In spite of the misdeeds of France she was not treated with undue harshness, but was allowed to keep her old boundaries, and the Prussian proposal to deprive her of Alsace and Lorraine was rejected. The slave-trade was abolished.

Switzerland was enlarged and guaranteed in perpetual neutrality. The balance of power, which had been disastrously upset by Napoleon, was so adroitly re-established as to endure through a period of forty years. But in many ways the rights of weak nationalities were sacrificed to the ambitions of the big imperial states. Poland was finally divided between Russia, Prussia, and Austria, Russia getting the lion's share. Finland was also given to Russia, which now began to appear—in succession to France—as the chief enemy of European freedom, and as the power which would be likely next to upset the balance. Prussia got great and important additions to her territory, and was still further advanced towards a position of complete ascendancy in Germany.



Signatures to 'the Scrap of Paper'

Austria gained large parts of North Italy, where her rule was unpopular and where the Italian resistance drove her into oppression. Belgium was yoked to Holland in an uneasy union, which was terminated in 1830 by a revolution of the Belgians against the Dutch. After this the British statesman Palmerston succeeded in negotiating the famous 'scrap of paper' guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, the tearing up of which in 1914 led to the entry of Great Britain into the war against Germany.

During the rest of the nineteenth century numerous wars and treaties were made; but none of them can be called of all-European importance. The Crimean War (1854-6), which re-established the balance at the expense of Russia, was a comparatively small affair, as also were the wars by which Italy attained nationhood. The German Empire, in



Punch's cartoon on the Greek frontier question, 1880¹

its modern highly organized and aggressive form, was established by means of a short war with Austria (1866) and a more important war with a new and inferior Napoleonic Empire in France (1870). The treaty which closed this war revealed the spirit which dominated the new Germany, for two great provinces were torn from France, and she was left in consequence burning with a passionate desire for revenge.

4. *The Concert of Europe.* During the latter part of the nineteenth century European affairs were conducted, and the

¹ By permission of the Proprietors of *Punch*.

balance of power precariously defended, by a loose agreement of the Great Powers, which is sometimes called the Concert of Europe. Germany, Russia, Austria, France, England, and (though of less importance) Italy generally managed to come to more or less friendly conclusions on any important issue. The most noteworthy instance of the working of this concert is seen in the Congress at Berlin which closed the war between Russia and Turkey in 1877-8. The Russians were deprived by the other powers of the fruits of their complete victory over the Turks. They were prevented from putting an end to the Turkish Empire in Europe and from setting up in its place a greatly enlarged Bulgaria. Independent, or semi-independent, states were indeed set up in the Balkans, but wide territories were left in the hands of Turkey. In this arrangement and in a number of other similar questions the Concert of Europe supplied a clumsy method of arriving at a general agreement regarding problems which might otherwise have led to acute differences between the Great Powers. However, during the closing years of the nineteenth century and the opening years of the twentieth, this uneasy Concert gradually disappeared, and in its place there were developed the two groups of Germany, Austria, and Italy—the Triple Alliance—and Russia, France, and England—the Triple Entente. Then came the Great War, in which Italy, after considerable hesitation, changed her allegiance and took the side of the Entente.

The greatest of all Peace Congresses was held in 1919, at the end of the Great War, to attempt the reconstruction of the world. In the series of treaties which were the outcome of this Paris Conference, an advance was made in the recognition given to the right of self-determination as possessed by all nationalities, however small. In some respects grave mistakes were made; but the elaborate machinery of the League of Nations was set up, with the design of checking future outbreaks of anarchic nationalism.

5. *International Arbitration.* During the last century some progress had been made in the attempt to reduce the occasions for warfare by the obligation, mutually undertaken by certain powers, to submit questions in dispute between them to

arbitration by an impartial tribunal. The first important agreement of this class was that of 1794 between Great Britain and the United States, contained in what is known as Jay's Treaty. Since then a large number of similar treaties have been concluded, and no doubt have tended to eliminate causes of friction and to bring about the solution of conflicts in accordance with justice



ARBITRATION. The Alaska Boundary¹

rather than force. But the reluctance of states to submit to any tribunal of arbitration questions involving, in their opinion, their honour or their independence, a reluctance which was especially manifested at the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, has rendered international arbitration, however admirable in theory, a very inadequate remedy

¹ By permission of the Proprietors of *Punch*.

in practice for the evils of international suspicion and hostility.

The need for an International Authority. Apart from the defect above indicated, peculiar to treaties of arbitration, the weakness of all treaties aimed at the restraint of aggression is the difficulty of enforcing them. There is no authority superior to the parties making the treaty, and able effectually to restrain them from breaking its provisions whenever they may think it to be to their interest to do so. Germany's action of 1914, in 'tearing up the scrap of paper' signed by herself and guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, is only one instance of the fact that a nation bent on aggression, or in dire military necessity, is not to be bound by honour—by regard, that is, for treaties which it has itself assisted in making, and which it has promised to respect.

Just as the balance of power is a precarious arrangement, liable at any moment to be upset: just as coalitions are clumsy and expensive attempts to right or prevent a wrong committed or threatened: just as the Concert of the Great Powers proved incapable of defending the world for long against selfish imperialism: so also treaties, however laboriously brought about and solemnly ratified, are always liable, in the absence of an international authority capable of enforcing them, to be suddenly disregarded and repudiated by any nation bent on self-aggrandizement, or fighting desperately for its life.

Hence it would appear that the saving of civilization from destruction at the hands of nationalism demands the institution of some international authority superior to the individual nation. We must now consider the attempts which have been made to establish such an authority, and the lines along which success is most likely to be achieved in these attempts.




THE HOPE OF THE WORLD.

PEACE. "THIS IS MY TEMPLE AND YOU ARE ITS PRIESTESS. GUARD WELL THE SACRED FLAME."

(The objects and needs of the League of Nations Union are set out on the opposite page.)

By permission of the Proprietors of *Punch*



VIII

Internationalism

The League of Nations. In 1899 and 1907 Peace Conferences were held at The Hague ; they owed their institution to the Tzar of Russia, and they made a vain effort to provide for the limitation of national armaments. Permanent courts of international arbitration were set up to deal with disputes voluntarily submitted to them, and rules were designed in order to lessen the horrors of modern warfare.

But the outbreak of the Great War, with the unrestricted use therein of poison gas, the bombing of towns from aeroplanes, and the destruction by submarines of hospital ships and merchant vessels, seemed to mark the futility of all the work done at The Hague and elsewhere with the object of preventing war, or of civilizing it if it broke out.

During the Peace Conference at Paris, in 1919, the American President, Mr. Wilson, made it his main object to secure the creation of a League of Nations to guarantee the peace of the world and forward the ends of civilization. It was largely owing to his efforts and to those of the English statesman, Lord Robert Cecil, that the League was finally established, and was joined by more than forty nations. It was provided with a permanent executive, and with a head-quarters at Geneva. The League, 'whose business is conducted by an Assembly in which each member-state has an equal voice, and a Council composed of representatives of the five principal allied powers and of four other states elected by the Assembly',

supplies the skeleton organization for a genuine international government, which shall effectually secure the peace of the world and prevent aggression by an automatic and immediate rallying of the whole resources of civilization against any state which begins war. Already there have been submitted to the consideration of the League a number of intricate international problems.

Difficulties of the League. The League is, however, heavily handicapped by the rule that unanimity is necessary in the Council to make its decisions effective, and by the fact that the League does not at present include Russia, Germany, or the United States; for without the addition of these great nations its activities and decisions can lay no claim to being genuinely representative of world opinion. The refusal of the United States to join—the result of a traditional American dread of becoming involved in the complicated problems of Europe—is especially to be regretted, since one result of the Great War was to leave the United States the strongest and richest nation in the world. The League also suffers severely from its lack of any means of enforcing its decisions other than economic pressure to be exerted by its members against the offending party.

Thus the League remains at present weak and incomplete. Yet there is hope that either this League itself, or some similar association including all the nations of the world, will eventually be able to express and enforce the public opinion of mankind in such a way as to render impossible for ever the excesses of aggressive nationalism. Meanwhile every effort towards the limitation of armaments is to be heartily welcomed, as tending to prevent the reappearance of that pre-war condition of Europe in which the nations groaned under the weight of monstrous armies and navies, armies and navies whose very existence, with that of the great armament industries supporting them, made the outbreak of a world war sooner or later inevitable, but which could never

(1) Surat: the early factory. 1638

L O N D O N,

*Cargoe of the Benjamin Arrived from Surat the
21th of November, 1693.*

	Pieces	Pounds
Bafts broad white	1100	
ditto narrow brown	2640	91900 Cowries
Chints	6180	29000 Coffee
ditto Caddy	420	11200 Indico
Coffaes	500	51000 Olibanum
Deribands large	7735	111000 Pepper
ditto small	240	25500 Sticklack
Paurkaes	66200	
Romalls	3485	
Sheets Agra	52	
Sorts	47	
Sovaguzzees	2880	

(2) An advertisement from Houghton's *A Collection for the
improvement of Trade and Agriculture*, 1693

be reduced, lest the nations possessing them should be weakened in comparison with their neighbours and rivals.

*The British Commonwealth of Nations.*¹ The League of Nations is the germ of what may some day develop into an authority able effectually to prevent the outbreak of international warfare. There are, however, actually in existence in the world two international associations which give a practical example of two different methods by which states and peoples may be combined into an effective whole while retaining all that they desire of independence. One of these associations is the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the other is the United States of America.

The future confederation of the world, in which every individual and every state shall have full opportunity for serving in freedom the interests of all mankind, will have to overcome difficulties of language, of national rivalry, and of practical organization far more serious than those encountered by either the British Commonwealth or the United States. But still a brief study of those associations may help to show us certain lines of advance along which civilization may be saved and the world united.

Trade Colonies. The British Commonwealth of Nations originated in the sixteenth century, when the spirit of adventure and exploration, and the passion for foreign trade and colonial settlement, began to burn fiercely in the hearts of Englishmen, as in those of Spaniards, Portuguese, Dutchmen, and Frenchmen. England was comparatively speaking a late comer in the field of this overseas development; but commercial expeditions were sent out east and west, and a large number of trading posts or 'factories' were established, especially in India, where successful competition with other European nations, the natural desire for the expansion of

¹ This term, which was officially adopted in the Treaty of 1921 between Ireland and the British Government, has been here employed as more appropriate than the old name 'British Empire'.

British trade and influence, and the necessity for obtaining security during the long disorders which accompanied the break-up of the Mogul Empire, had by the end of the eighteenth century led to the establishment of British supremacy. At first governmental authority in India remained in the hands of the old trading company, but in 1858 it was transferred to the British Crown, which carried on the administration through a Viceroy and public services manned by English and Indian officials. In 1919 a Reform Scheme was introduced which provided for the handing over of various departments of government to Indian ministers responsible to elected assemblies, and for the future enlargement of the powers thus given, the goal being the self-government of India within the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The American Colonies. Entirely different from the trading colony, of which the British dominion in India forms the most noteworthy example, is the settlement colony, the development of which has given its distinctive character to the British Commonwealth of Nations.

In the sixteenth century the Spaniards had been successful in planting prosperous settlements in Central and South America. Early in the seventeenth century the English followed their example and established two types of settlement colonies on the eastern coast of North America. In the south the settlements were mostly organized by wealthy courtiers and were aristocratic in their institutions and sentiment. They depended on the cultivation of cotton, for which they employed slave labour imported by an iniquitous traffic from Africa. In the north, on the other hand, were established settlements of religious refugees from England—chiefly Puritans, the more extreme Protestants. These settlements were agricultural and, later, industrial communities, republican in institutions and sentiment, and dependent for their existence on the hard work of the settlers in what was at first a wild forest region inhabited by fierce savages.

PLANTATION-NEWS.

*The Remainder of the Extracts from our Correspondent in
JAMAICA.*

‘ Conversation here has lately run very much upon a
‘ strange Affair: A Sailor about two Months ago enter’d
‘ himself on board the Falmouth, who was soon challeng’d
‘ by one of his Mates, for the only Son of the late Lord
‘ —, who was Heir to the Title and Estate of the Earl of
‘ — Upon this he made a Discovery of himself, declaring
‘ how he was sent into Ireland by a certain Nobleman, un-
‘ der whose Care he was entrusted, and at eight Years old
‘ (just upon the Death of his Father) sold as a Slave into Pen-
‘ silvania for seven Years, before the Expiration whereof he
‘ attempted to make his Escape, but was retaken, and, by a
‘ Law of the Country, oblig’d, for his Elopement, to serve
‘ seven Years more; and that a little before the End of his
‘ second Slavery, he again ran away, and got down to the
‘ next Sea-Port, where he enter’d himself with the Master
‘ of a Merchant Ship coming to this Island. A Gentleman
‘ on board the Eleanor has made an Affidavit, that he knows
‘ him to be related to the Family, and that he remembers
‘ that Advertisements were publish’d when the Boy was mis-
‘ sing, and believes this to be him. Another, who was his
‘ School-Fellow, and at whose Father’s House he lodg’d,
‘ makes Affidavit to the same Purpose. The Admiral has
‘ order’d he should walk the Quarter-Deck, as a Midship-
‘ man, till the Truth can be manifested.

From The Gloucester Journal, Feb. 17, 1740-1

ONE that has been bred a Trader in the Country, and is
willing to serve a Master of a Ship or a Planter or Store-
keeper in the Plantations, to look after his Affairs and keep
his Books; desires some such Employ.

Advertisement from Houghton’s Collection, 1696

PLANTATIONS. As distinct from the purely commercial
‘ factories’ of India the agricultural settlements in America
were known as ‘ plantations’.

Gradually the isolated settlements prospered and expanded, until there was a continuous line of British colonies from a point near the mouth of the river St. Lawrence to the borders of Florida. As yet the settlers had not penetrated far inland; and for long the French held the basins of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi to the west of the English colonies. However, as a result of the Seven Years' War, Florida and Canada were transferred to England (1763). Then came a disastrous attempt on the part of the British Government to tax the rapidly growing wealth of the settlers and to impose irksome trade restrictions. The cry 'No taxation without representation' had been the watchword of British liberty ever since the days of Magna Charta, and it was now taken up with enthusiasm


by the colonists, who had no representatives in the British Parliament. Relations between the Mother Country and the Americans became so strained that the only hope of avoiding a conflict lay in granting the widest concessions to colonial opinion; but this the British Government (then under the control of an incapable ministry, subservient to an obstinate King, George III) refused to do on a sufficiently generous scale. 'Great Britain did not favour an equal partnership,



COMPANY PROMOTION. A satiric playing-card of the time of the South Sea Bubble

which was probably the only solution, but regarded America as a dependency.'

The result was a civil war lasting eight years (1775-83), in which the thirteen colonies sank their differences and rivalries



in order to oppose the British. The Americans fought with great courage and determination, and were admirably guided by their noble leader, George Washington. They were also helped by Holland, France, and Spain, whilst England could find no allies. Finally the British were defeated, and the American colonies won their independence as the United States of America.

The Dominions. But the British Government in time learnt its lesson, and when, in the nineteenth century, there came demands for self-government from Canada and the other settlement colonies, these demands were duly granted. Early in the twentieth century this was done even in the case



CANBERRA. Ploughing the streets of the great new Australian Capital, 1924

of the Boer Republics of South Africa, which only a few years before had been defeated in a desperate struggle for their independence.

In this manner there were gradually built up great self-governing dominions in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa—dominions which are bound to the Mother Country only by ties of affection and interest, and by common allegiance to the nominal authority of the British Crown.

But, whilst the Dominions have self-government so complete that at the Peace Conference of 1919 and in the League

of Nations they ranked and still rank as separate states, yet in regard both to foreign affairs and to matters affecting the inter-relationships of the British Commonwealth as a whole they act together in a union none the less genuine because it is undefined. In the Great War the Dominions rallied with the completest loyalty to the support of the Mother Country. Moreover, in the important and successful Imperial Conferences held of recent years there is the germ of a closer connexion and of a more convenient central control over the policy and organization of the whole Commonwealth.

Ireland. The grant, in 1921, of complete self-determination to Ireland, which became a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, not as a settlement colony, but as an ancient mother country in equal partnership with Great Britain, furnished a new example of the manner in which nations may be associated. They should be free to live their own lives, manage their own affairs, evolve their own culture, but should no longer be solitary units in complete isolation. They must be able to share wider opportunities, and to contribute their ideas and experience to a larger whole, which in time must embrace the whole of humanity.

Thus the nature of the British Commonwealth points to a different line of advance towards the world-state from that adopted by the League of Nations. The latter is a union resembling that formed by the American colonies in their war against England. It is an association of equal states, formed from a new beginning for one specific object, in this case the restraining of aggressive nationalism. The British Commonwealth, on the other hand, is a union of nations connected by circumstances of history, grouped round one central state for general purposes, and held together by a community of aims and sentiments.

The British Commonwealth of Nations is like a family, with the affections and common interests of family life, but with no fixed regulations controlling its relationships, and



Punch cartoons illustrating the self-government of the Dominions
By permission of the Proprietors of *Punch*

with the fullest liberty accorded to its individual members. The League of Nations, on the other hand, is like a committee of the heads of a number of families, each with its private jealousies and ambitions.

The Constitution of the British Commonwealth. The British Commonwealth is thus an association of free states, which can act as one whole, and which yet preserves in the highest degree the liberty of each constituent part. The old term 'Empire' is inappropriate to such a voluntary association for mutual advantage, united by ties not of force but of sentiment; for in the typical empire the central power ruthlessly exploits its dependencies for its own benefit.

The most noteworthy feature about the constitution of the British Commonwealth is that this constitution is elastic and unfixed. It may even be said not to exist at all. It is embodied in no written document accurately defining the relationships between the constituent states. There is no provision even against the withdrawal of any state from the Commonwealth.

Experience has shown that fixed constitutions, whilst they may possess the advantages of clearness and precision, present, owing to their rigidity, serious disadvantages. Such constitutions are apt to hamper the future with outgrown rules and safeguards only applicable to the different conditions of the past. On the other hand, a state, or an association of states, with an unwritten and elastic constitution can grow steadily and smoothly, devising new expedients to meet new problems in an orderly and natural process of evolution and expansion. On the whole it is in this manner that England and the British Commonwealth of Nations have developed. The history of other lands has shown that the existence of a fixed constitution implies a grave risk that when changes become needful in order to meet altered conditions, such changes can only be carried out by means of violent revolution or civil warfare. The course of events in

France since 1789 illustrates this danger in a peculiarly vivid manner.


In the British Commonwealth ties of affection and interest, and common allegiance to principles of freedom, have proved a force strong enough, not only to make the Commonwealth one solid whole when danger threatens from without, but also to breed a spirit of political moderation and of willingness on the part of the minority to submit to decisions which may in themselves be excessively distasteful, but which represent the will of the majority. This latter characteristic is probably the most essential of all prerequisites for the successful and orderly working of democracy. The lack of it, as we have seen, wrecked Greek democracy.

No one doubts that undue pressure exerted from England upon the Dominions to enforce the will of the Mother Country would result in the destruction of the Commonwealth. The knowledge of this, on the one hand, guarantees freedom to the Dominions, and on the other hand imposes sanity and moderation upon the Mother Country. Thus a bond of family affection can be maintained which is all the stronger because it relies neither on force nor on fixed regulations.

The Diverse Elements of the British Commonwealth. There is a third type of territory within the Commonwealth, in addition to the states which have developed from the old trading colonies on the one hand, and the old settlement colonies on the other. This third type comprises great areas in Central Africa and elsewhere, whose savage peoples have come under the rule of England as the result either of war or of the imperial expansion which took place during the latter part of the nineteenth century, when the nations of Europe were vying with each other in a race to obtain control of those parts of the world which had not as yet come under European domination. England was one of the most successful competitors in this race, and secured for herself—in what was at times a somewhat rough-and-ready

under mandate or not, as well as Mesopotamia and Palestine, is that of trusteeship, and that the goal before those territories is that already reached by the Dominions, namely self-government.

Another element within the British Commonwealth is formed by certain important strategic points, for example Gibraltar, Malta, Aden, Hong Kong, which are held because of their value as coaling stations and as centres of com-



The earliest engraving of ADEN

munication on the great sea-routes which connect the various outlying parts of the Commonwealth.

Thus the British Commonwealth of Nations contains many diverse elements—great and ancient peoples such as those of India, who came originally under British control through reasons of commerce, and are being rapidly prepared for autonomy : self-governing dominions in Canada and Australia and elsewhere : vast backward territories inhabited by peoples still low in the scale of civilization : small and vitally important strategic centres of communication : a mother country—Ireland—in equal partnership with Great Britain herself.

We may not be far wrong in concluding that from many

points of view some such family of nations, bound by no artificial and rigid restrictions, but dwelling together in peace and goodwill, forms an ideal relationship for the peoples of the earth. Whether such a world commonwealth can be brought into practical existence does not yet appear; but, rightly constituted, it would probably provide the most satisfactory means of securing to every individual and every people a full opportunity for serving in freedom the whole of mankind.

The United States. We have already briefly indicated the manner in which the American colonies of England combined to wrest their independence from the Mother Country. The new nation was faced by many hard problems. North and South were worlds apart. Each of the thirteen states which formed the original Union was acutely jealous of any infringement of its own rights on the part of the central government. Conditions of life were still largely those of the frontier, rough, undisciplined, without adequate education or respect for law, handicapped by the lack of communications. Yet the good sense and the innate vitality of the American people rapidly began to triumph over all obstacles.

Their first and perhaps their greatest achievement was the Federal Constitution of 1787, which is still in force. This 'indestructible union of sovereign states' gave a new value and meaning to the federal principle. The states of the Union—then thirteen, now forty-eight in number—with their own popularly elected governments, are responsible for factory inspection, health regulation, criminal law, and the like, and are the government with which the average citizen most frequently comes in contact. To the Federal Government are delegated certain specified powers: war and peace, post office, coinage, regulation of commerce, matters which experience has shown cannot be efficiently administered by the states. The federal power is not, however, dependent upon the goodwill of the states (as the power of the League

By this means they can fill the Plantations with *Blacks* and have Stock enough to furnish the *Spaniards*, which at this time make Overtures to them, and to shew what a Trade it might be, take the following Account.

The *Spaniards* treated with the Royal *African Company* of England for 5000 whole Pieces of *India* the Year for 7 Years to be delivered at some of the Islands.

But to make this good, the Company were to ship from *Africa* 7 or 8000 Pieces, out of which the *Spaniards* were to chuse 5000 whole Pieces, and the Company to dispose of the rest.

A whole Piece of *India* was according to the Ages of the *Negroes*, Male or Female. Those between 15 and 45 or 35, were a whole Piece; between 4 and 8, were 2 for 1; between 8 and 15, or above 45 or 35, were 3 for 2, and those under 4, were cast in with the Mother.

Now considering the Allowances, there were to be ship'd from *Africa* yearly about 10000 Persons in 7 Years 70000.

The *Spaniards* not being in good Credit, negotiated this by *Augustino Lomelino* and other *Genoeses* Bankers at *Madrid*, in and about 1664, and transferr'd it to *Signor Ferini* at *Amsterdam*; But the *Dutch War* in 1665 broke all off.

This I have from a Gentleman who had the Perusal of a Book of the Letters and Negotiations of the Treaty.

Such a Trade as this made by an Act of Parliament for 99 Years certain, wou'd much improve all our Western Plantations. and by degrees perhaps find as good Mines in *Carolina* as in *Potosi*; 'twou'd encrease Seamen and Ships of Strength for our Use at home, and encourage Growths and Manufactures here great; 'twill bring us in Gold apace to make *Guineas* with, and the Goods from the Plantations will fetch us in Silver, besides the Silver is gotten for the *Blacks*: And this is what I verily believe might have been already done, had not our Misunderstandings hinder'd us; and I do think I shall never meet with the Man that can and will fairly gainsay it. But perhaps this is not best for us: For if *Jessurun* shou'd wax fat, he wou'd kick his Maker: Therefore God thinks fit to let us be divided, which will keep us poor, and perhaps more humble.

The tradition of slavery in North America.

Part of a leading article in a Journal of 1694 advocating a further development of the trade

of Nations upon the goodwill of the several nations) for the enforcement of its laws; it has what James Madison, the principal author of the constitution, called a 'complete and compulsive operation' upon the individual citizen, through its own officials and courts of justice. The Congress of the United States (Senate and House of Representatives) makes the laws of the Union; the President, elected practically by universal suffrage for a four-year term, executes the laws; and the Supreme Court of the United States (which one might call the earliest Court of International Justice) settles conflicts between the several states, decides questions of disputed jurisdiction between the State and Federal Governments, and, when Congress passes a law beyond its constitutional powers, declares it null and void.

A country of such vast extent and complex interests as the United States could only be united under a Federal Government, and the rapid westward growth of the country strained even that. Whenever Congress passed a law, such as a protective tariff, that hurt the interests of the minority, it appealed to the rights of the states against the power of the Federal Government. President Andrew Jackson scotched by vigorous action one such movement in 1832 without killing it; in 1861, when the Republican party, pledged to stop the extension of negro slavery, elected Lincoln to the presidency, the slave-owning states seceded from the Union. Abraham Lincoln, in origin a rough frontiersman, proved himself a leader of iron determination, yet of admirable humanity and wisdom, so that the liberation of the slaves and the preservation of the Union from disruption were due to his statesmanship, no less than the popular faith in the Union of 1787.

At a time when the Civil War was at its height, Lincoln delivered a brief address on the occasion of the institution of a national cemetery on the battle-field of Gettysburg. That speech has come to be regarded as one of the world's highest masterpieces of oratory. At its close occur these

words, nobly expressive of the true spirit of the great nation to which Lincoln belonged :

‘ It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honoured dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion ; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain ; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom ; and that government of the people for the people, by the people, shall not perish from the earth.’

Lincoln was assassinated in the moment of victory ; and his country suffered sorely from the loss of his wise and kindly leadership. His spirit of generosity and moderation would have found a noble sphere of service for his nation during the period of reconstruction after the war, when, as things turned out, the South was grievously ill used.

It is too early to pass judgement on the policy of President Wilson during and after the Great War. At the Peace Conference of 1919, though many of his views failed to find embodiment in the resulting treaties, he succeeded at least in the creation of the League of Nations.

The Trusts. Many great problems face the United States. One is the problem of controlling the great commercial corporations, or Trusts, which have sprung up and gained a sinister degree of power, partly as a result of the successful exploitation of the enormous natural resources of the Union, and partly because of the vast continental area within which commerce can be carried on without customs restrictions, foreign competition being also rendered ineffective by means of high import duties.

The Trusts not only exercise a tyrannical control over small businesses, and over the prices at which goods are sold to the public, but they have also come near to establishing an actual plutocracy, i. e. the rule of the nation by its wealthy citizens, achieved through the manipulations of democratic institutions,

and especially of State politics, by the misuse of money. At the beginning of the present century a great campaign against the Trusts was carried on by the vigorous and masterful President Roosevelt; many laws controlling and regulating

business were passed; but the money power still constitutes a grave threat to American democracy.

Immigration. Another great problem is that of the inflow of foreigners desirous of settling in the United States. For many generations there has been a steady movement of population from Europe to America. At first this immigration was chiefly from the countries of



Roosevelt and the Meat Trusts. (*Punch* cartoon)
By permission of the Proprietors of *Punch*

north-western Europe, so that the incoming population, being akin in race and language to the native born, was absorbed and assimilated without undue difficulty. However, during recent decades, increasingly large numbers have come from eastern and southern Europe, whilst for a time there was also a steady flow from China. These new elements belong to races, speak languages, and are marked by practices and standards of

life, which differ very widely from those of their newly adopted home. They tend to form distinct groups or colonies in the localities where they settle. In some areas they altogether swamp the American population. Yet the immigrants are in the main hard-working members of the artisan and peasant classes, and hence represent the most desirable elements of the populations from which they come. The majority of them are strong and healthy and eager to win success in the new country by their own efforts.

In the years between 1820 and 1917 thirty-three million immigrants arrived in the United States, and for the single year 1914 the total was nearly one and a quarter million.¹ Clearly the assimila-

tion of such masses of foreigners forms a very pressing and difficult national problem. Its solution demands, above all else, an efficient and complex system of education, whereby

¹ The economic and social calamities in Europe which followed the war of 1914-18 produced in America the defensive Immigration Act of 1924, by which arrivals are limited to 150,000 a year, the quota allowed to each nation favouring those races of northern Europe which are the backbone of the American people.

REASONS

For ESTABLISHING the

COLONY of GEORGIA,

With Regard to the

TRADE of GREAT BRITAIN,

T H E

Increase of our People, and the Employment and Support it will afford to great Numbers of our own Poor, as well as foreign persecuted PROTESTANTS.

With some Account of the COUNTRY, and the Design of the TRUSTEES.

By Benjamin Martyn, Esq.

*Hec Natura præscribit, ut homo homini, quicunque sit, ob eam ipsam
Causam tamen, quod is homo sit, consilium vellet*

CICERO De Officiis, Lib. III.

L O N D O N .

Printed for W. MEADOWS, at the Angel in Cornhill. MDCCLXXIII.

Early arguments for emigration


the children of aliens may be trained in the language and culture and ideals of America. In this direction magnificent work is being done—work which amounts to the welding into one new American race of some of the finest material taken from almost all the varied and antagonistic races of the Old World. ‘The fusing process which Europe has failed to bring about by a thousand years of political scheming and force is being quietly but quickly carried out in the schools and universities of the United States,’¹ by creating a great international community of men, already a hundred million strong and composed of a new interracial type of humanity.²

For it appears to be a fact that there is being created in the United States not only a new form of international culture, based on the English language and a common allegiance to the Republic, but a real new type of humanity—an interracial American type. ‘Some careful observations made recently by Professor Boas on American immigrants from various parts of Europe seem to show that the new environment does in some unexplained way modify the head-form³ to a remarkable extent. For example, amongst the east European Jews the head of the European born is shorter and wider than that of the American born, the difference being even more marked in the second generation of the American born. At the same time, other European nationalities exhibit changes of other kinds, all these changes, however, being in the direction of a convergence towards one and the

¹ Professor J. Holland Rose in the *Contemporary Review*, November 1921.

² It must be remembered that this process of assimilation does not apply to many millions of negroes, the descendants of the slaves held by the South before the Civil War. Except in the states where their numbers are relatively small, the American negroes are kept by public opinion and mob action, if not by law, in a condition not much advanced over helotry.

³ Head-form is generally taken as the most satisfactory standard in determining differences of race. The quotation is from Marett's *Anthropology*, p. 75.



IMMIGRATION. Ellis Island, outside New York, where immigrants undergo examination and quarantine

same American type.' Thus the effect of immigration into the United States promises to be the creation of a new race of men, towards the building of which all the chief Western races shall have contributed.

The fact that such fundamental, international, and interracial work is being performed on such a wide scale and over so enormous a territory, endowed with such lavish natural wealth, is full of hope for the future of mankind. The United States is already by far the richest and strongest and most populous of all Western nations. In the future she will probably exercise an even greater attraction to immigration than in the past. She will continue to mould the raw material thus obtained into a new and unified type of humanity. What may prove a great step towards superiority has recently been taken in the suppression of the liquor traffic, which in the past has meant untold misery, wastage, and inefficiency. The American traditions of peaceful expansion and of isolation from the complexities of European statecraft may be taken as an assurance that any dominance of the American race will not be imperialistic and aggressive, but beneficent towards the rest of the world.

We have thus completed our brief survey of the great outstanding problem of modern history, the problem of the control of anarchic and aggressive nationalism. We have considered certain measures which have been vainly taken in the past to solve that problem. And we have noticed in more detail the three most hopeful modern solutions, an association of nations, a 'family' of nations, and a new international nation.

We must now give some attention to certain other factors which have been of great importance in the modern period of history.



IX

The Return of Greece

The Renaissance. In 1453 the Turks captured Constantinople, and a large number of Greek scholars, bearing with them their precious manuscripts, sought refuge in more western parts of Europe. But long before this time there had begun, especially in Italy, a great revival of interest in the ancient civilization of Greece and Rome. A new passion had been developing for art and literature and the refinements of a free and cultured human life. The coming of the Greek scholars gave a great impetus to this Humanism, as it is sometimes called.¹ The science and poetry and art, the religious and ethical and philosophical conceptions of the ancient world were studied and imitated with the most eager zeal. Civilization seemed to be born again after the long death of the feudal ages; and hence this whole glorious epoch has come to be known by the name of the New Birth, or the Renaissance.

A marvellous outburst of creative genius took place in this Renaissance. Among scores of famous artists the most famous were Raphael and Michelangelo: among scores of scientists, Leonardo da Vinci. Of the many great scholars of the age Holland produced the greatest in Erasmus, and of

¹ It is however maintained by some modern historians that the fall of Constantinople did not increase to any appreciable extent the enthusiasm for Greek studies which already existed in Italy.

the many great poets England produced the greatest in Shakespeare ; for Shakespeare truly belongs to the Renaissance, whose mature influence came a century later in England than in Italy.

The work of the Renaissance would have been impossible without the invention of printing (in the middle of the fifteenth century), which brought about the wide dissemination of the new-old knowledge, and became in this—and later in rendering possible the universal extension of education—of the highest importance to the progress of mankind.

The Italian Renaissance was not only a return to classical art and thought. It was in addition a fierce revolt against everything medieval, against feudalism and ignorance and asceticism, but also against moral restraint and even Christianity itself. Hence it showed a lack of high ideals regarding duty and character, and tended to degenerate into shameless luxury, extravagance, and profligacy. Politically it expressed itself, not in a revival of democracy, but in the exaltation of the type of tyrant seen in Machiavelli's *Prince*, a despot above every law, human and divine. The Papacy, which had taken a leading part in encouraging the creative genius of the Renaissance in Rome, and had thus glorified the city with triumphs of painting and architecture, became luxurious and corrupt. The Popes began to exploit for selfish and worldly purposes the spiritual prestige and authority which the Roman Church possessed over the minds of the common people of Europe. It was high time for a further awakening. The art and beauty of Greece had come back to the world. There was urgent need for a revival also of the deeper aspects of her civilization.

The Reformation. The corruption of the Papacy led first to fierce criticism and scathing ridicule. In France, Germany, Holland, and England, Erasmus became the leader of a great party of enlightened men demanding reform within the Church. The revival of ancient learning was spreading in

Published by the Royal Society.

Philosophical Transactions; giving some account of the present Undertakings, Studies and Labours of the Ingenious in many considerable parts of the World. The Eighteenth Volume: for the Months of November and December, 1694. Numb. 214.

The CONTENTS.

- I. **A** Paper asserting some Mathematical Inventions to their true Authors, by Dr. David Gregory, Astr. Prof. Savil. II. *Mons Cassini's Tables for the Eclipses of the First Satellite of Jupiter, reduc'd to the Julian Stile, and Meridian of London* by Mr. Edm. Halley, S. R. S. III. *A Paper about Magnetism, &c.* by Mr. J. C. IV. *Of a Lamb suckled by a Weather Sheep: From Mr. Tho. Kirk*, S. R. S. V. *A Second Letter concerning the same*, VI. *An Account of Books.* 1. *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, by W. Wotton, B. D. R. S. S. 2. *Horti Malabarici. Pars Undecima, Duodecima & Ultima, with Remarks thereon*, by T. R. M. D. S. R. S.

A Course of CHYMISTRY will be carried on by George Wilson, at the Herme's Head in Well-Yard, behind St. Bartholemew's Hospital in Smithfield, in which will be performed above One Hundred several Operations. They who desire to know such a Process, with all its necessary Attendants, may, for Three Guineas each, be accommodated, if they will before the Second of July next pay to Mr. Marmaduke Brown, Stationer, at the Sign of the Cross-Keys on Ludgate-Hill, near Fleet-Bridge, Two Guineas, and Subscribe for the payment of the third Guinea when the Course shall be half run through, that he may provide Necessaries for the carrying it on.

SCIENTIFIC ADVERTISEMENTS at the end of the 17th Century. From Houghton's Collection, Feb. 15, 1694-5, and June 29, 1694

these countries also, and men were being taught thereby to think for themselves, to criticize established authority, and to desire liberty. The north was by nature more serious and more moral, less enthusiastic and less artistic, than was Italy. In Germany especially there was abroad a spirit of deep moral earnestness, and a resolve that corruption should be swept away and righteousness established. Men had been led, notably by a martyred prophet, John Huss, to desire a return to the original teachings of Christ, the religion of brotherhood and equality and trust in God,¹ freed from doctrines which had been superadded by the Catholic Church.

Thus the way was open for the coming in Germany of a radical reformer, Martin Luther (1483-1546), who went far beyond Erasmus in his attacks on the Papacy, and demanded—with great courage and in the face of all the powers of Church and Emperor—that the reforming party should cut itself completely loose from the Roman Catholic system. Luther's cause was eagerly taken up by many of the turbulent German princes and feudal nobles, who saw in the new 'Protestant' movement an opportunity for increasing their own authority in opposition to that of the emperor. Luther, who was a great prophet but no organizer, gave predominant power in the new Church called by his name to the prince or king, as head of the national or state Church. Religion in his system was thus largely subordinated to politics. But in Switzerland another form of Protestantism was established and organized on a democratic and representative basis of church-government, by a Frenchman named John Calvin (1509-64). Calvinism spread widely in France, where however—as in Germany—the new movement strengthened for a time the hands of the feudal magnates against the central government.

¹ Huss was a learned Czech, who lectured at Prague at the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth centuries. He was excommunicated and subsequently burnt alive, in 1415. He had gained his ideas largely from the great English reformer of the fourteenth century, John Wycliffe.



ERASMUS



CALVIN



LUTHER

Calvinism also became in time the form of Christianity characteristic of Scotland and the northern Netherlands.


In England, King Henry VIII, wishing to get a divorce from his Spanish queen, and failing to persuade the Pope to

grant him one, separated the English Church from Rome, and placed himself at the head of it. He also dissolved the monasteries and confiscated much of the property of the Church, using a portion only of the proceeds for the foundation of schools and the building up of a navy. England suffered severely, at least for a time, from the closing of the monasteries; for the new landlords who had bought the Church lands from the king were rapacious and tyrannical. They converted large parts of



Callot's engraving of the beggar of his time, 1622

their estates from plough-land to pasture, thus throwing many labourers out of work, and they claimed and enclosed as their own the common lands of the villages. Hence there was a vast increase of poverty, and England was filled with hosts of 'sturdy beggars', men able to do hard work but unable to find it to do. In the past, moreover, the monasteries had distributed lavish charity to the poor, but now this source of relief was gone.



THE REFORMATION. Preaching at St. Paul's Cross

Thus for a long time the Reformation movement was very unpopular in England, and there were determined popular risings against it.

The Counter-Reformation. The Reformation was sternly opposed by the great Emperor Charles V (1519-56), and before his death a movement set in within the Roman Church which in time checked and to a certain extent neutralized the work of the Reformation, leaving Europe divided between Roman Catholics and Protestants, each division violently antagonistic to the other. This movement is known as the Counter-Reformation. It was aimed at the removal from within of the abuses which marked the Roman Catholic Church, and at strengthening that Church against further Protestant assaults.

Many of the corruptions of the Church were swept away by this Counter-Reformation. The Papacy became earnest and moral, instead of worldly and vicious, as it had been in the time of the Italian Renaissance. The great religious Order of the Jesuits was founded, and became an unarmed but efficient and highly organized army of soldiers of the Church, men sworn to poverty in her cause, and serving her with complete obedience under an iron discipline. The Jesuits carried the message and organization of Roman Catholic Christianity far and wide through the newly discovered continents and countries in east and west, and endeavoured by every means both to re-establish the position of the Church in those European lands which had become Protestant, and to safeguard it in the lands which still remained mainly Catholic.

The Inquisition—a tribunal of summary jurisdiction with the widest powers, appointed to suppress other forms of religion than Catholicism—was set to work far and wide over the Roman Catholic world, and strove to extirpate Protestantism even by torture and burning.

The great Catholic monarchy of Spain, whose king regarded himself as the humble servant of the Church, lavished un-

stintingly in her cause the immeasurable resources of America and of a great part of Europe.

For a time it seemed as though Protestantism would be stamped out by force. But the gallant revolt of the Netherlands against their Spanish oppressors, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada by the English, established a balance between the religions which endured through the seventeenth century, in spite of the failures of Catholicism in the Thirty Years' War and its successes under Louis XIV, who regarded himself as the champion, not only of French nationalism, but also of Catholic Christianity.

Finally, in the eighteenth century, the growth of the spirit of rationalism and religious toleration, together with the absorbing interest of national warfare in Europe, and of colonial and commercial expansion overseas, brought to an end the age of bitter religious rivalry and conflict between Catholics and Protestants and the consequent persecutions.

Influence of the Renaissance and the Reformation. The re-birth of classical learning in Italy meant more than the coming again into the world of Greek art and literature. It meant also the re-birth of the Greek spirit of free inquiry and criticism, directed towards every aspect of human life and achievement. It meant a broad-minded and progressive cultivation of all that is best in human life, so that every side of a man's being should be developed to its highest capacity, and the individual citizen trained to make the most of all his powers of body and mind. Thus in the Italian Renaissance the Greek spirit revived in freedom of thought. Men were taught again, as Socrates had taught them nearly two thousand years before, to think for themselves, to take for granted no claim to superior authority or wisdom or holiness, but to sift all things to the bottom by enlightened and constructive criticism.

On the other hand the reformation of religion in the north meant that this new spirit of freedom in thought and criticism,

which in Italy had tended towards selfishness, was directed with intense moral earnestness to a cause far beyond any individual life, the cause of religious liberty and spiritual truth. The succeeding wars of religion, dreary and blood-thirsty though they are, at least show that men are willing to give all that they have and are to the service of something which they regard as more precious than life itself.

Most of all, the Reformation marks the return to the world of the Greek spirit of freedom in respect to liberty of conscience. In Luther's thunderings against the corruptions of the Papacy, and in his fearless assertion of his right to worship God in his own way, there sounds again the voice of Socrates choosing, before his Athenian judges, death rather than the abandonment of his search for truth, and declaring to them that he must obey God rather than man.

The great revolutionary leaders of Protestantism, William the Silent in Holland (see below, p. 270) and Oliver Cromwell in England, saw farther than Luther himself in this respect ; for in the face of the intolerance of their contemporaries they not only asserted their own right, and that of those who agreed with them, to worship God in their own way, but they also conceded that right to those whose views conflicted with their own. Hence they established the principle of genuine religious toleration.

Discovery. The revival of Greek learning went hand in hand with another great force in working for the broadening of men's outlook upon the world. This force was the discovery that the world was a far larger and more interesting place than had been supposed.

At the end of the thirteenth century a Venetian merchant named Marco Polo had made an adventurous journey to China, where he had remained for twenty years as an important official in the service of the Chinese Emperor. On his return voyage he had visited seaports in India and other parts of the East. The book which he wrote about his adventures roused the greatest interest throughout Europe.




Columbus's fleet reaching America. From a woodcut of 1494



Magellan's ship *Victoria*

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the conquests of the Turks were blocking the old land routes by which trade had passed between Europe and Asia. In the endeavour to find new routes the Portuguese sailors began gradually to push their voyages of discovery farther and farther south along the coast of Africa. At last Diaz rounded the Cape of Good



‘The rich trade with the East’

A PERSIAN CARAVAN

Hope (1486), and a few years later Vasco da Gama reached Calicut on the south-west coast of India (1498). From that time on, discovery in the East went on apace.

In 1492—the year in which the final consolidation of Spain was marked by the capture of Granada, the last stronghold of the Moslem Moors—a Genoese sailor named Christopher Columbus, who was in the service of the King of Spain, set sail westward with three small vessels. His object was to discover a western route to India by which the Spanish monarchs might be able to tap the rich trade with the East. For in those days men had only recently learnt that the earth

is round, and they still thought that the distance around it was far less than it really is.

After many disappointments, and threats of mutiny from his crews if he did not turn back, Columbus finally reached the West Indian Islands, which he supposed to be islands lying off the coast of China. He returned to Spain after discovering Cuba and Haiti, but made another voyage the next year and found many more islands. A few years afterwards he explored part of the coast of the mainland of South America.

Early in the sixteenth century a Spaniard named Balboa reached the Pacific Ocean across the Isthmus of Panama. Half a dozen years later Magellan made the first voyage round the world; and about the same time Cortez conquered for Spain the great and wealthy American-Indian Empire of Mexico. In 1531 Pizarro reached Peru, where the precious metals were so common that 'gold and silver seemed to be the only things that were not wealth'. The Peruvians were a people of a very considerable degree of culture, who had attained great skill in cultivation, irrigation, and engineering. Their government was despotic, but in the main remarkably benevolent. Every department of the people's life, from birth to death, was elaborately supervised and regulated. A rigorous caste system decreed that no man could rise above the station in which he was born. The government settled for every citizen his work, his holidays, his food, his clothing, his dwelling-place, even the date and circumstances of his marriage. Every Peruvian received from the state a house and a grant of land sufficient to keep him and his family from poverty. 'The Empire was constantly being enlarged by conquest, but it was the invariable rule that the conquered tribes should be admitted to full rights of citizenship, and encouraged by every means to settle down as orderly subjects of their new masters.'

Pizarro attacked and overthrew this immense and highly

organized empire with a little force of 168 men—one of the most extraordinary exploits in all history.

The Spaniards governed their vast conquests badly, draining them of their wealth and enslaving the native populations. It was not till the seventeenth century that the English in New England and the French in Canada established true settlement colonies, built up on the hard manual work of the settlers, and growing rich, not by exploitation, but by hard industry. As we have already seen, the southern American colonies of England depended on slave labour; and the abominable trade in negro slaves, who were carried off from their homes in Africa, shipped across the Atlantic under conditions of barbarous cruelty, and then sold in America, continued till early in the nineteenth century, when it was brought to an end largely through the efforts of the great philanthropist, William Wilberforce.¹

The process of discovery went on through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the seventeenth the Russians penetrated across Siberia to the Pacific Ocean; and in the eighteenth the great English sailor, Captain Cook, surveyed the coasts of Australia, New Zealand, North-Western America, and many islands in the Pacific Ocean.

During the nineteenth century the interior of Africa was explored by numerous gallant pioneers, of whom the most famous was David Livingstone, the friend and champion of the negro race against all its enemies.

In the early years of the twentieth century the North Pole was reached by an American explorer named Peary, and the South Pole by the Norwegian Amundsen and the Englishman Scott—the latter paying for his success with his life when he was within eleven miles of safety.

¹ Slavery was abolished in the British Empire in 1833, and since that time—to the enormous benefit of mankind—has been ended almost everywhere on earth, except in certain parts of the interior of Africa, notably Abyssinia.

Thus one of the chief features of the modern period of history has been the 'expansion of Europe', the spreading over the earth of European culture and colonization and power, as the process of discovery, trade, and settlement has gone forward. The whole movement bears a striking resemblance—on a vastly enlarged scale—to the movement by which, at the very dawn of history, the Greek culture and colonization and power, inspired by the same spirit of adventure, and by the same motives of discovery and trade and settlement, spread far and wide over the ancient Mediterranean world.

Science. The revival of Greek learning in the Renaissance brought back into the world the Greek spirit of free inquiry into the nature and causes of things.

In the Middle Ages, except where the influence of enlightened Arab thinkers had made itself felt, scientific thought had been shackled by the authority of the Church, by the general ignorance and apathy, and by the dogmatic and uncritical application of received theories, which took the place of the observation of facts when men were dealing with natural phenomena.

But with the Renaissance the authority both of the Church and of traditional theories began to be challenged. Men became eager once more, as the Greeks had been, to get down to the bed-rock of reality, to know facts, to build up knowledge by accurate examination and comparison of details, and by practical experimentation. For instance, there had been endless discussions amongst medieval philosophers as to how and why bodies fall faster or slower according to their weight. It had been taken for granted that they did so fall. Not till the Renaissance had brought a real awakening of the scientific spirit was the matter settled. Galileo climbed the tower of Pisa and dropped two unequal weights. They reached the ground at the same time, and the matter which had been so interminably discussed by theorists, and

upon so totally false a basis, was settled once and for all by means of one simple experiment undertaken by a scientist.



A forerunner of the scientific spirit in the Middle Ages had been the Englishman Roger Bacon, who lived in the thirteenth century and insisted on the necessity for practical experimentation. He foreshadowed steamships and flying



ROGER BACON and a Pupil


machines, and experimented with gunpowder. But the Church condemned him to imprisonment as a heretic on account of his presumptuous investigations; for the Church regarded herself as the fountain of all knowledge.

Leonardo da Vinci, at the end of the fifteenth century, was the most noteworthy of the scientists of the Italian Renaissance. In addition to being a very great painter, he made accurate observations on natural history and anatomy, discovered the real nature of fossils, and became also a distinguished engineer.



Mechanical drawings by Leonardo da Vinci

About the same time Copernicus proved that the earth moves round the sun. Later, Galileo invented the telescope,




Galileo's Telescope

and with it discovered the spots on the sun and the moons of Jupiter. These and other discoveries regarding the nature and vastness of the Solar System had a great effect in the broadening of men's minds; for they could no longer regard themselves, in the old way, as dwelling on a world which was the centre of everything, nor think of the sun, moon, and stars as made especially for their own convenience.

Francis Bacon, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, laid down the rules of scientific research, insisting on the fundamental importance of an accurate study of detail and on careful experimentation. 'Sweep


away all theories and common notions and apply the understanding, thus made fair and even, to a fresh examination of details.' Bacon thus formulated and enforced the principles stated by his namesake three and a half centuries before.

From that time onward the triumphs of the scientific genius have never ceased. In the middle of the seventeenth



AN OBSERVATORY in 1587, with astronomical instruments


century the Royal Society was founded in England for the study of scientific facts. Under its stimulus the discovery and formulation of natural laws went steadily forward. Towards the end of the same century, Isaac Newton discovered the Law of Gravitation, and also new mathematical methods of dealing with scientific problems.



A Chemical Laboratory in 1747. (*Universal Magazine*, 1747)

In the middle of the eighteenth century science began to be practically applied to industry and manufacture, resulting in the most wide-reaching changes.

Machinery was invented, at first to increase the output of cotton and woollen goods, later for all types of manufacture. The steam-engine was developed by James Watt into a source of power which revolutionized the conditions of industry. It was employed first to run the machinery in factories, and afterwards to drive steamships and to pull trains.



From the engraving by J. G. Smith.


The famous Encyclopaedia of the French scholar Diderot, which began to appear in 1752, summed up the achievements of science, thought, and industry to that date, and gave an immense stimulus to political reform, as well as to scientific and industrial enterprise.

The Factory System. The new factories almost entirely superseded the earlier system of cottage industry, about which Defoe had written early in the eighteenth century :

‘At every considerable house [in a northern district of England] there was a manufactory. . . . The houses were full of lusty fellows, some at their dye-vats, some at their looms, others dressing the cloth ; the women and children carding and spinning, all being employed from the youngest to the eldest ; scarce anything above four years old but its hands were sufficient for its own support. Not a beggar to be seen, not an idle person. . . . The people in general live long ; they enjoy a good air ; and under such circumstances hard labour is naturally attended with the blessing of health, if not riches.’

In place of this system of healthy cottage industry there sprang up great factory towns, full of huge mills. To these towns the industrial population came in crowds, till the conditions of life in them became terribly bad. The people lived herded together like beasts, amidst filth and disease. They had no proper homes. They had to work long hours, in what were frequently most unhealthy surroundings, for miserable pay. Women and children were employed in factories and mines under circumstances which came near to slavery.

It is true that the factory system led to vastly increased production, to the accumulation of great wealth in the hands of the factory owners, and to the wide diffusion through the world of cheap manufactured goods. It is true also that the industrial revolution, as the whole great change is called, added enormously to the trade and power and riches of those nations—England, the United States, France, Germany, and Belgium—which formed the most favourable ground for the



Modern Factory Development. Scene in the 'Black Country'

introduction of the new system, i. e. which were richest in coal and iron. But for a time the result was terrible misery for the labouring classes.

During the nineteenth century, partly through the unselfish endeavours of philanthropists, but mainly through the organization by the workers themselves of Trade Unions able to claim and enforce the rights of labour, conditions of life in the centres of industry were improved, and laws passed preventing the grosser abuses of the factory system. But the glaring discrepancy between the wealth of the 'capitalist' and the poverty of the labourer still persists, and in many respects the competitive system of industry leads to wastage and inefficiency.

Hence the relationships of capital and labour, and the modification of the competitive system, constitute one of the most pressing problems that face humanity to-day. Various methods have been suggested for solving that problem. The Socialist believes in the ownership by the State of the means of producing wealth, and wishes the State to operate industry for the benefit of the whole community. But experience gained during the Great War, when the deficiencies of the competitive system led to a wide adoption of State-management, seems to indicate that such a solution of the industrial problem will involve the setting up of a vast and burdensome bureaucracy charged with the control of trade and manufacture. It is also contended that, in the absence of the stimulus afforded by competition, the spirit of initiative and discovery would flag.

Another solution frequently put forward to-day is that each industry should be controlled by its own workers for their own benefit; but this seems likely to involve the risk of serious industrial and political disorganization, and even of anarchy.

A more extreme type of thought is that represented by Karl Marx, a German nineteenth-century Socialist, who

preached the 'class war', to be waged by labour against capitalism and the middle classes.

A great and intensely interesting experiment in the organization of industry by and for the 'proletariat', or common people, has been carried on by the disciples of Karl Marx, who began to control Russia soon after the overthrow of the old corrupt despotism in 1917. In some respects this experiment of the Bolsheviks, as the Russian Marxists are called, has achieved remarkable results; but it has been hampered by foreign interference, by the land-hunger of the peasantry, and by the ignorance and lethargy of the vast mass of the Russian population, while the acts of cruelty and intolerance by which it has been accompanied have prejudiced European opinion against it. It cannot be said to have increased the happiness and prosperity of Russia, if these are judged by external standards; for by 1920 the population of Petrograd had fallen from some two millions to seven hundred thousand, and the city had the appalling death-rate of over eighty per thousand per annum. Moreover, in 1921 a frightful famine overtook the eastern districts of European Russia, leading to the starvation of a population estimated at twenty millions. The severity of this famine appears to have been intensified by the requisitioning of grain by the Bolshevik government, by the dislocation of the means of communication, by the resulting impossibility of distributing food supplies, and by the lessening of the incentive to food production consequent on the prohibition by the Bolsheviks of all private trade.¹

Perhaps the most hopeful solution yet devised for the industrial problem is to be found in the system of 'Co-operation', which is spreading rapidly in a large number of countries, and is leading to the establishment of thousands of co-operative factories, distributing stores, dairies, banks, building societies,


¹ The dislocation of communications is at least in part due to the cessation of trade relationships between foreign countries and Russia, as she cannot adequately supply herself with railway material.

&c. Under this system, 'Producers and consumers combine, or consumers become producers, in order to make and distribute goods by manufacturing, buying and selling in common (and also, in agricultural co-operation, for the provision of loans on credit), the profits being shared either directly (in dividends) or by spending them for common purposes'. In England alone the Co-operative Movement has over four million members, with an annual turnover of over three hundred million pounds.


The Gifts of Science. Although the modern organization of industry has led to such acute problems, there cannot be the slightest doubt that the revival of the Greek spirit of scientific inquiry and its application to practical life have conferred countless benefits upon mankind.

Up to the beginning of the eighteenth century the agriculture, weaving, iron-working, and communications of western Europe were still much as they had been in the time of the Romans, and in some respects were in a worse condition. Then, in a few generations, came a series of inventions which revolutionized the conditions of human life. The scientific method of investigation had already led to the formulation of natural laws, which were now widely applied in such a way that during the past two centuries man has succeeded, by means of science, in achieving a general conquest of Nature, and in becoming the ruler instead of the slave of his environment. He has learnt to build railways and steamships, whereby food may be brought from the ends of the earth, famine prevented, and vast populations enabled to live in prosperity on territories whose agriculture alone would be utterly incapable of supporting them. He has made enormous advances in his knowledge of Nature, and of the world in which he lives. Above all, he has learnt the history and structure of the human body, the nature of disease, and the means of combating it.

Early in the seventeenth century Harvey discovered that




An ancient Roman Aqueduct in Sicily



Aqueduct of the Shropshire Union Canal in Wales

ANCIENT AND MODERN ENGINEERING

the blood circulates through the body. Late in the eighteenth Jenner began to practise vaccination against small-pox. In 1846 the first serious operation was performed under an anaesthetic. Before that time such operations had scarcely been possible at all. In one famous hospital before the



CHARLES DARWIN

discovery of anaesthetics an average of only thirty-seven persons per annum had consented to undergo operations. Fifty years later the annual average in the same hospital was 3,700.¹ This forms only one instance of the marvellous progress of medical science, which has resulted in an inestimable lightening of suffering and saving of life.

In 1859 there appeared Charles Darwin's great book, *The Origin of Species*, which totally changed men's conceptions of the manner in

which life has developed and progressed by the evolution of higher forms from lower, right up to man himself.

About the same time the French scientist Pasteur became engaged in investigations of the most crucial importance regarding the manner in which various diseases are brought about by the agency of the minute creatures called bacteria. He was also occupied with the invention of methods by which the destructive work of these bacteria might be combated through inoculation with preparations of the same bacteria.

¹ Robinson and Beard, *Development of Modern Europe*, p. 417.

The above are only one or two names chosen almost at random from the great roll of the men of science who have used their knowledge of nature and of life for the conquest of disease and the saving of their fellow men from suffering and untimely death.

Science has produced terrible engines of destruction—long-range artillery, high-explosive shells, poison gas, submarines. Its application to industry has led to grievous miseries and hardships. But it has rendered possible an enormous increase of the population of the world :¹ it has prolonged human life, reduced the death-rate, and given to man an entirely new command over the forces of nature and his own destiny.

Autonomy. Apart from the medieval revolts of peasants and citizens against feudal overlords and foreign imperialism, the revival of the Greek spirit of autonomy (i. e. the right of a people to self-determination and to freedom) may be chiefly traced to the desperate revolt in which, during the latter part of the sixteenth century, Holland asserted and made good her right to freedom from the cruel Spanish domination.

The importance of that revolt (1572-1609) can scarcely be over-estimated. In a war of nearly forty years a little people consisting mainly of farmers and burghers, penned in on a strip of water-logged country perhaps one hundred miles long by thirty miles broad, successfully defied the mightiest empire in

¹ The population of Europe is estimated to have been some fifty millions in A. D. 1400. By 1837 it had risen to 221 millions, by 1882 to 328 millions, and by 1907 to 405 millions (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*). Another estimate (that of the *Statesman's Year-Book*) places the population of Europe in 1918 as high as 503 millions. The population of America rose from 68 millions in 1869 to 150 millions in 1907. These increases are largely due to the fact that modern industry and communications enable an enormous population, fed from elsewhere, to be supported on a comparatively small area. That such concentrations of human beings may be attended by serious evils, unless the conditions of housing and the standard of life generally are maintained at a proper level, has already been indicated.

the world—an empire commanding the wealth of the Americas, the best generals of that age, and a seemingly inexhaustible succession of magnificent armies composed of the finest soldiery in Europe. The Dutch, who had no allies worth the name, suffered with iron fortitude the most fearful horrors and privations. In the issue they not only won their independence, but whilst they were doing so built up behind their besieged cities and their ruined country-side the first naval power of Europe and a world-wide commercial supremacy.

This marvellous fortitude, resulting in so great a triumph, was due mainly to the faith and courage and indomitable determination of one man, who was foully murdered by his country's enemies before the struggle was half over. That man, who more than any other individual brought back into the world the Greek spirit of autonomy, was William the Silent.

In the eighteenth century the revolt of the American colonies against England under the guidance of Washington, who was a leader second only in greatness to William the Silent, revived the same spirit once more.

A generation later came the despotic imperialism of Napoleon, which may be said for a time to have revived some aspects of the conception of the world-state embodied in the Roman Empire. The world-state of Napoleon was to be centrally and autocratically ruled, but was to be organized on the principles of equality between man and man, of an enlightened system of law, and of a liberal and polished culture.¹ But such an idea was a hopeless anachronism at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Napoleon was broken by the nationalism which in one sense he had disregarded, but of which in another sense he demonstrates the most aggressive and dangerous outcome. In Russia, Spain, and Germany nationalism arose and crushed him. In England nationalism had never ceased to combat his aggression.

¹ It was also, in France, based on a certain degree of popular consent, obtained through plebiscite (popular vote).

INTRODUCTION.

PERHAPS the sentiments contained in the following pages are not yet sufficiently fashionable to procure them general favour; a long habit of not thinking a thing wrong, gives it a superficial appearance of being right, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defence of custom. But the tumult soon subsides. Time makes more converts than reason.

As a long and violent abuse of power is generally the means of calling the right of it in question, (and in matters too which might never have been thought of, had not the sufferers been aggravated into the inquiry) and as the King of England hath undertaken in his own right, to support the Parliament in what he calls theirs, and as the good people of this country are grievously oppressed by the ^{they have} an undoubted privilege to inquire into the pretensions of both, and equally to reject the ^{of either.}

In the following sheets the author hath studiously avoided every thing which is personal among ourselves. Compliments as well as censure to individuals, make no part thereof. The wise, and the worthy, need not the triumph of a pamphlet; and those whose sentiments are injudicious, or unfriendly, will cease of themselves, unless too much pains are bestowed upon their conversion.

The cause of America is in a great measure the cause of all mankind. Many circumstances hath, and will arise, which are not local, but universal, and through which the principles of all lovers of mankind are affected, and in the event of which their affections are interested. The laying a country desolate with fire and sword, declaring war against the natural rights of all mankind, and extirpating the defenders thereof from the face of the earth, is the concern of every man to whom nature hath given the power of feeling; of which class, regardless of any censure, is the

AUTHOR.

P. S. The publication of this new edition hath been delayed, with a view of taking notice (had it been necessary) of any attempt to refute the doctrine of independence. As no answer hath yet appeared, it is now presumed none will, the time needful for getting such a performance ready for the public being considerably past.

Philadelphia, Feb. 14, 1776.

The defeat of Napoleonic imperialism was thus in itself a revival of the Greek spirit of autonomy. Half a century later that spirit reached its most brilliant expression in modern times during the series of romantic and heroic episodes by which Italy was freed from the domination of foreigners and despots, and united round the constitutional kingdom of Piedmont. In the enthralling story of the Italian 'Resurrection', extending from 1848 to 1870, the main figures—in addition to the gallant King of Piedmont, Victor Emmanuel—are those of Mazzini, Cavour, and Garibaldi. Mazzini was the republican philosopher who taught Italy to believe in unity and freedom, and during the brief months of the Roman Republic in 1849 showed the world perhaps its most remarkable example of the philosopher turned practical ruler. Cavour was the great and wise statesman of Piedmont who struggled with matchless patience and determination against Austrian imperialism. Garibaldi was the chivalrous peasant-captain, the idol of the Italian patriots, who led a series of forlorn hopes against the national enemies, and whose little force of red-shirted volunteers was miraculously successful in defeating the armies of the despot of Naples and in uniting his territories to a liberated Italy.

Constitutionalism. We have already considered the beginnings of parliamentary government in England, and have seen how the monarchy was compelled to adopt constitutional methods of rule, by a series of reforms originating in Magna Charta.

During the sixteenth century the strong autocratic monarchy of the Tudors succeeded in dispensing with much of the control of Parliament; but the efforts of the weak and obstinate Stuarts in the seventeenth century to do the same led first to expostulation, then to a demand for the re-establishment of the old constitutional liberties of England, and finally to a great civil war between King and Parliament. In this war the King was decisively defeated, largely through the organiz-

ing genius of Oliver Cromwell, who later became head of a military government which proved more unconstitutional than the monarchy had ever been. This led to a restoration both of the power of Parliament and of the constitutional monarchy. By the end of the century Parliament had successfully vindicated once more its right to dispose of the crown, and to control all the acts of the King through ministers responsible to itself.

During the eighteenth century the machinery of parliamentary government was still further developed, the party system becoming firmly established, under which, when a government goes out of power, its members instead of being outlawed or executed remain in Parliament as the opposition. The principle was also worked out in practice that the ministers act together in the Cabinet, under the guidance of the Prime Minister, and that they stand and fall as one, the whole Cabinet being responsible for the measures and policy of each of its members. But the franchise remained very narrow, and was fatally open to corrupt manipulation by the great landowners.


During the nineteenth century the franchise was extended more and more widely by a series of Reform Bills, the chief of which was passed in 1832 after a fierce but constitutional struggle with the aristocracy, which still largely controlled the machinery of parliamentary election, and through it the government of the country. In 1918 the franchise was extended to women. A few years before the power of the House of Lords to frustrate the will of the people as expressed through the Commons had been drastically curtailed, so that at the present time a democratically elected House of Commons exercises complete sovereignty in England. If the Cabinet loses the confidence of the House, i. e. fails to command a majority, its members must either resign and make room for a Cabinet which does command such a majority, or they must ask the King to dissolve Parliament and to

order a fresh election, in the hope that the people may show its approval of their policy by electing their supporters. The fact that Parliament may thus be dissolved and a new election held at any time when a critical question arises renders the English legislature far more sensitive to public opinion—far more generally representative of the will of the people—than is the case under certain other democratic constitutions, where the members of both the legislative assemblies are chosen for a definite term of years, so that, if any unexpected problem arises, it has to be settled by men who have not been elected because of their views on that question.

Thus, under the modern constitution of Great Britain, which in its chief features has been imitated far and wide through the world, the power of the King and that of the Lords is completely subordinated to the authority of the people acting through their representatives in the House of Commons.

In a republic more power is usually given to the president than in a constitutional monarchy is given to the King. The second chamber of the legislature (or Senate) is also generally much more powerful than is the English House of Lords, and a separate authority (e. g. the Supreme Court of Judicature in the United States) may be set up to see to it that the several branches of government do not exceed their respective functions.

The Greek spirit of reverence for the fundamental principles of constitutional law as the bulwark of liberty and democracy has thus been brought back into the world, largely through the gradual growth of British parliamentarism, and its embodiment in laws and institutions which have been very extensively copied by the enlightened nations of the world. In many countries a new factor has been introduced in the adoption of a written constitution—an expedient which is apt to shackle progress at times through its rigid and mechanical control, but which is useful in fixing and regularizing the



The Extension of men's suffrage. Doyle's Cartoon in 1831



Punch's Cartoon of the Women's Suffrage movement, 13 July 1910
By permission of the Proprietors of *Punch*

institutions of a newly established democracy, and which often becomes the object of a reverent affection very similar to that felt by a citizen of ancient Athens for the fundamental laws of his city-state.

Democracy. Although during the eighteenth century England was a constitutional monarchy, yet the franchise was so narrowly limited, and real political power was so jealously retained by the aristocracy, that the government cannot by any stretch of imagination be described as democratic.¹ Elsewhere in Europe this century sees autocrats—more or less benevolent—organizing the various nations, often very efficiently, in self-improvement, in expansion, in antagonism to each other, but failing to liberate the masses of the people from the oppressive survivals of feudalism.

In 1783, when the independence of the American colonies was recognized by England, the colonists began to organize their new nation on the most democratic lines, lines which had been suggested to them by a series of great political philosophers, of whom the French thinker, Rousseau, is the chief. Hereditary titles and privileges were abolished. The franchise was simplified, equalized, and broadened to include practically the whole adult male population of European race. Social and economic changes secured a wide distribution of property, especially of land. A number of years later the excellence of these reforms roused the English visitor, William Cobbett, to fierce anger against the aristocracy, which in his own country, up to the Reform Bill of 1832, 'trampled on king as well as people'. But the most noteworthy effect of these reforms, outside the United States themselves, was their influence on thoughtful and liberal-minded Frenchmen.

In France there had been during the eighteenth century

¹ In 1792 it was estimated that 154 patrons, 40 of whom were nobles, controlled the election of a majority of the members of the English House of Commons, through the corrupt manipulation of the franchise.

much political speculation and discussion. Montesquieu had submitted existing political institutions to severe scrutiny. A number of brilliant writers known as the 'Encyclopaedists' had proclaimed the iniquity of many of the prevailing conditions. Rousseau (1712-78) had enunciated the doctrine that man,



AFTER THE REFORM BILL. William Cobbett (first) and Place (third) enter the House while the Duke of Wellington and the aristocrats stand in the background. Cartoon by J. Doyle

virtuous and happy by nature, had fallen from that state owing to a defective social and political system. His writings, though their reasoning was unsound, obtained enormous popularity. Thus when in 1789 the French King was compelled by the bankruptcy of his government to summon the States General (the French Parliament), which had not met since 1614, the nation, suffering from the manifold evils of a vicious and oppressive political system, was ready for an outburst of democracy, before which feudal privilege

and autocratic monarchy were swept away like straws before a torrent.

The significance of the French Revolution is primarily that of a great movement towards equal rights and democratic freedom—towards a state of society and a system of government in which every man, whatever his birth, possesses an equal opportunity for self-fulfilment and the leadership of his fellows. Inasmuch as it was such a movement the French Revolution was perhaps the most remarkable revival of Greek ideals that has ever taken place. The nations of Europe saw the awakening of a people one and indivisible, self-governing, united in equal right and brotherhood, with no privileged oligarchy, as in ancient Rome, with no subject race held down in slavery, as in America, with no oppressive relics of feudal aristocracy such as lingered on in England. That vision and that ideal were quickly clouded by the horrors of mob rule, by the bloody despotism of the 'Committee of Public Safety', by a fierce revival of aggressive nationalism under the guise of republican propaganda, by the military imperialism of Napoleon, and finally by a reaction towards the old corrupt autocracy under the restored Louis XVIII. Yet nothing could blot from the minds of men the memories of that resurrection of democracy. In defiance of all the precautions and oppressions of the Holy Alliance the tide of liberal opinion steadily gained ground, and in 1848 broke out into revolution once more in almost all the countries of Europe. That 'wonderful year' was again followed by a period of reaction, yet no tyranny on earth can permanently resist the power of revolutionary democracy; and either by an orderly process of constitutional change or by sudden revolution every country in Europe came in time to abolish the privileges of the aristocracy, to destroy the power of despotism, and to extend the franchise to the masses of the population. Experience has shown that the right working of such democratic institutions depends very largely

upon the introduction of an effective and compulsory system of education.

Thus the Greek spirit of free and equal democracy—the spirit which was summed up in the watchword of the French Revolution, ‘Liberty, Equality, Brotherhood’—has come back to earth, and is now honoured everywhere, except in Russia. There democracy and representative government, as that term is elsewhere understood, have been rejected, on the ground that they inevitably place too much power in the hands of the educated and leisured middle class, whose interests are identical with those of the capitalistic system of industry—the system under which the owners of the capital wherewith an industry has been organized and equipped receive the profits or bear the losses of that industry, the labourers receiving agreed wages, irrespective of the success or otherwise of the undertaking, but no share of the profits.

The Bolshevik government in Russia is an attempt to establish the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’—to make the workers themselves supreme in industrial and national life. The method adopted to this end is the institution of a complicated system of councils (called ‘Soviets’) for each industrial and territorial unit, through which the workers and peasants shall themselves actually control their factories and their villages.

But the Soviet system is terribly clumsy, entailing a vast multiplication of councils with differing grades and functions and areas of control. Amongst the ignorant and unenterprising masses of Russia it has inevitably resulted in the concentration of despotic power in the hands of a few capable but unscrupulous leaders, one of the chief of whom in a recent book has declared, ‘The revolution requires of the revolutionary class that it should attain its end by all methods at its disposal—if necessary by an armed rising ; if required by terrorism. A revolutionary class which has conquered power with arms in its hands is bound to, and will, suppress, rifle

in hand, all attempts to tear the power out of its hands.' ¹ Such words are but a repetition of Robespierre's declaration regarding the policy of the Committee of Public Safety, which in 1793 and 1794 drowned revolutionary France in blood. 'The Principle of our policy must be this: To govern the people by reason and the enemies of the people by Terror. Terror is only Justice more prompt, more vigorous, more inexorable, and therefore Virtue's child.'

Trotsky is still more outspoken regarding democracy: 'We repudiate democracy in the name of the concentrated power of the proletariat.' Thus Bolshevism represents one more challenge flung by a single class, and in the name of its own despotic power, at the Greek ideal of equality of opportunity for every man of every class. ²

Conclusion. We have thus brought to an end our brief study of the process by which civilization has appeared and developed amongst men. True civilization is the condition in which every man shall devote every side of his nature, in its fullest capacity, to free and willing service of humanity as a whole. We have noticed some of the chief enemies of that process—selfish desire, selfish caste and class spirit, selfish faction spirit, selfish feudalism, selfish nationalism. These enemies of civilization are dangerous because they put the interests of a section—the interests, namely, of individual, of caste, of party, of class, or of country—above the interests of the whole.

¹ Trotsky, *The Defence of Terrorism*.

² A writer of advanced Liberal views, who in 1920 saw the Petrograd Soviet in session, says of it: 'It was in fact a mass meeting incapable of any real legislative activities; capable at the utmost of endorsing or not endorsing the Government in control of the platform. Compared with the British Parliament, it has about as much organization, structure, and working efficiency as a big bagful of miscellaneous wheels might have, compared to an old-fashioned and inaccurate but still going clock' (Wells, *Russia in the Shadows*, p. 120).

We have studied the great forces which have combated these enemies in the cause of civilization, first the great spiritual and religious forces which had their birth in the East—the Chinese ideal of service for the future, the Indian denunciation of caste and desire, the Moslem demand for brotherhood, the Christian gospel of the Kingdom of God in which all men, as the children of one divine Father, shall dwell together in love and mutual service.

Again, we have considered the manner in which the Greeks first began to embody civilization in practical and working institutions, organized on the principles of constitutional law, of autonomy, of democracy, of freedom in thought and conscience, of scientific research, and of the building up of a world-state. We have seen how Rome made her contribution in the practical organization of the world-state, and in the elaboration of a great system of orderly civil and criminal law regulating the relations of man with man.

We have then studied the disastrous results of the barbarian invasions, the growth of feudalism, and after it that of aggressive nationalism. We have passed in review some of the forces which combated these two great enemies of civilization, and especially the factors which in the modern world are making for the growth of internationalism, i.e. for the creation of a world-state which shall effectively curb anarchic nationalism, whilst at the same time affording the maximum of liberty to every people and every individual. In this connexion we have noticed the idea of a League of Nations, that of a Family of Nations (the British Commonwealth of Nations), and that of a new International Nation (the United States of America).

Finally, we have seen how the working principles and institutions of true civilization, as laid down long ago by the ancient Greeks, have been reborn in the modern world: and how that rebirth has meant a vast numerical increase in the human race, and an immense progress towards freedom

in a great variety of spheres. The permanency of the progress thus made depends upon the manner in which our modern freedom and civilization are based upon the deep spiritual truths first enunciated in the East. For without the spirit of love and brotherhood and service for the future, and without the conquest of selfish instinct, our civilization must be revealed as no true and permanent civilization, but merely a superficial culture or a transitory phase fated to such destruction as overtook Rome.

Yet there has never been so great a hope before mankind as there is to-day, so great a hope of civilization, so great a hope of the coming of the Kingdom of God. That hope can only be realized as every man in all the earth freely and willingly devotes his whole life and all its activities to the service of humanity.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

About 500,000 B. C.	The Java man.
" 250,000 B. C.	The Heidelberg man.
" 150,000 B. C.	The Piltdown man.
" 50,000 B. C.	Neanderthal men [chipped flint tools, burial, fire].
" 35,000 B. C.	Cro-Magnard men [cave pictures].
" 10,000 B. C.	Neolithic man [cultivation, polished tools, tamed animals].
" 6000 B. C.	Sumerian culture in Mesopotamia.
" 5000 B. C.	Egyptian culture.
" 4000 B. C.	Cretan culture [seafaring].
" 3700 B. C.	Great Pyramid of Cheops in Egypt.
" 2750 B. C.	Akkadian Empire in Mesopotamia.
" 2000 B. C.	China a united Empire.
" 1500 B. C.	Phoenician culture.
" 1500 B. C.	Aryans enter India and Greece.
" 1200 B. C.	Jews settled in Palestine.
" 1100 B. C.	Assyrian Empire in Mesopotamia.
1200-1000 B. C.	Cretan Empire destroyed by Greeks.
" 850 B. C.	Kingdom of David and Solomon.
" 800 B. C.	Carthage founded.
" 800-500 B. C.	Greek period of colonization.
753 B. C.	Foundation of Rome.
621 B. C.	Laws of Draco at Athens.
606 B. C.	Chaldaeian Empire in Mesopotamia.
594 B. C.	Laws of Solon at Athens.
587-538 B. C.	Captivity of the Jews in Mesopotamia.
550 B. C.	Jewish Prophet Isaiah. Buddha and Confucius lived about this time.
546 B. C.	Persians overthrow Lydian Empire.
539 B. C.	Persian Empire in Mesopotamia.
510 B. C.	Roman Republic founded.
508 B. C.	Laws of Cleisthenes at Athens.
494 B. C.	Persians capture Miletus.
494 B. C.	Roman Commons obtain Tribunes.
490 B. C.	Persians defeated at Marathon.
480 B. C.	Persians defeated at Thermopylae and Salamis.
479 B. C.	Persians defeated at Plataea.
469-399 B. C.	Socrates
461-429 B. C.	Pericles in power at Athens.
451 B. C.	Codification of laws at Rome.
445 B. C.	Roman Commons gain right of intermarriage with nobles.
429-347 B. C.	Plato the Philosopher.
384-322 B. C.	Aristotle the scientist and philosopher.
367 B. C.	Licinian laws at Rome.
338 B. C.	Philip of Macedonia conquers Greece.
334-323 B. C.	Alexander in Asia.
332 B. C.	Alexander in Palestine and Egypt.
331 B. C.	Alexander overthrows Persian Empire.
323-283 B. C.	Euclid the mathematician.

310 B. C.	Book of Jonah.
287-212 B. C.	Archimedes the engineer.
285-222 B. C.	Heron the engineer.
283 B. C.	Final defeat of Etruscans by Romans.
281-275 B. C.	War of Rome with Pyrrhus.
276-194 B. C.	Eratosthenes the mathematician.
272-231 B. C.	Asoka reigns in India.
264-146 B. C.	Wars of Rome with Carthage.
218-203 B. C.	Hannibal in Italy.
214 B. C.	Great Wall of China begun.
201 B. C.	Roman Empire in Spain.
200 B. C.-200 A. D.	Han dynasty in China.
167 B. C.	Revolt of Jews from Syrian Greeks.
150 B. C.	Yueh-Chi Mongols enter Western Asia.
141 B. C.	Syria recognizes independence of Jews.
133 B. C.	Roman Empire in Asia Minor.
100 B. C.	Expansion of Chinese Empire westward.
100-87 B. C.	Marius in power at Rome.
89 B. C.	All Italians admitted to Roman citizenship.
88 and 81-80 B. C.	Sulla in power at Rome.
67-2 B. C.	Pompey's victories in the East.
67 B. C.	Rome conquers Palestine.
65 B. C.	Mongolians first come into touch with Rome.
59-49 B. C.	Julius Caesar in Gaul.
55-54 B. C.	Julius Caesar in Britain.
44 B. C.	Assassination of Caesar.
31 B. C.	Octavian (Augustus) Roman Emperor.
6 B. C. (?)	Birth of Jesus Christ.
29 A. D.	Crucifixion of Christ.
55-120 A. D.	Tacitus the historian.
70 A. D.	Revolt of the Jews against Rome and destruction of Jerusalem.
102 A. D.	Chinese reach the Caspian Sea.
212 A. D.	All free inhabitants of the Empire given Roman citizenship.
247 A. D.	Goths cross the Danube.
270 A. D.	Caste-system of industry enforced by law at Rome.
284-305 A. D.	Diocletian Emperor.
312-337 A. D.	Constantine Emperor.
330 A. D.	Foundation of Constantinople.
395 A. D.	Final division of the Roman Empire.
410 A. D.	Goths capture Rome.
449-613 A. D.	Conquest of England by Angles, Jutes, and Saxons.
451 A. D.	Defeat of the Huns under Attila at Chalons.
455 A. D.	Vandals sack Rome.
475 A. D.	Hun conquests in India.
476 A. D.	End of the Western Roman Empire.
493 A. D.	Theodoric the Goth King of Italy.
527-65 A. D.	Justinian Emperor of Constantinople.
568 A. D.	Lombards enter Italy.
570 A. D.	Birth of Muhammad.
618 A. D.	Tang dynasty in China.

622 A. D.	Flight of Muhammad to Medina.
632 A. D.	Death of Muhammad.
634 A. D.	Battle of the Yarmuk [Arabs defeat the Romans of Constantinople].
637 A. D.	Battle of Kadessia [Arabs defeat Persians].
668 and 675 A. D.	Constantinople besieged by Arabs.
712 A. D.	Arab conquests in India.
715 A. D.	Greatest extent of the Arab Empire.
718 A. D.	Defeat of the Arabs at Constantinople.
732 A. D.	Charles Martel defeats the Arabs at Tours in France.
754 A. D.	Donation by Pepin of lands to the Pope.
768-814 A. D.	Charlemagne King of the Franks.
774 A. D.	Charlemagne confirms Pepin's donation.
800 A. D.	Charlemagne Emperor of the West.
800-1050 A. D.	Invasions of the Northmen.
827 A. D.	Egbert King of all England.
871-901 A. D.	Alfred King of all England.
910-1157 A. D.	Greatness of the Cluniacs.
919 A. D.	Henry the Fowler King of Germany.
955 A. D.	Otto the Great defeats the Hungarians.
960 A. D.	Sung dynasty in China
962 A. D.	Otto the Great crowned Emperor at Rome.
987 A. D.	Hugh Capet unifies France.
980-1037 A. D.	Avicenna of Bokhara.
1000 A. D.	Afghan invasions of India.
1039-56 A. D.	Henry III Emperor.
1056-1106 A. D.	Henry IV Emperor.
1058 A. D.	Seljuk Turks capture Baghdad.
1066-87 A. D.	William I (Norman Conqueror) King of England.
1073-85 A. D.	Gregory VII Pope.
1077 A. D.	Henry IV humiliated at Canossa.
1095-1271 A. D.	The Crusades.
1096 A. D.	The People's Crusade.
1099 A. D.	Crusaders capture Jerusalem.
1155-90 A. D.	Frederick Barbarossa Emperor.
1162-1227 A. D.	Jenghiz Khan the Tartar Emperor.
1166 A. D.	Jury system established in England.
1176 A. D.	Battle of Legnano [Lombard League defeats Frederick Barbarossa].
1187 A. D.	Saladin recaptures Jerusalem.
1198 A. D.	Death of Averroes of Cordova [Arab philosopher].
1212 A. D.	Children's Crusade.
1212-50 A. D.	Frederick II Emperor.
1214-94 A. D.	Roger Bacon the scientist.
1214 A. D.	Battle of Bouvines won by King of France.
1215 A. D.	Magna Charta [Great Charter of King John of England].
1234 A. D.	Tartars conquer China.
1235 A. D.	Land peace of Frederick II.
1236-42 A. D.	Invasions of Europe by the Tartars.
1253 A. D.	Honorary magistrates in England [afterwards called Justices of the Peace].

1265 A. D.	Simon de Montfort summons first English Parliament.
1265-1321 A. D.	Dante.
1271-95 A. D.	Marco Polo's travels.
1295 A. D.	Edward I of England summons Model Parliament.
1302 A. D.	French Parliament (States General) first summoned.
1302 A. D.	Battle of Courtrai: Flemish burghers defeat King of France.
1305-77 A. D.	Papacy in exile at Avignon in France.
1314 A. D.	Scots defeat Edward II of England at Bannockburn.
1315 A. D.	Swiss defeat Hapsburgs at Battle of Morgarten.
1338-1453 A. D.	Hundred Years' War between England and France.
1346 A. D.	English archers defeat French Army at Crécy.
1356 A. D.	English archers defeat French Army at Poitiers.
1368 A. D.	Ming dynasty begins in China.
1376 A. D.	English Parliament impeaches the King's ministers.
1378 A. D.	Two Popes, one at Rome, the other at Avignon.
1386 A. D.	Swiss defeat Hapsburgs at Battle of Sempach.
1399 A. D.	Chrysoloras begins to teach Greek at Florence.
1400-1600 A. D.	Period of the Renaissance.
1415 A. D.	English defeat French at Battle of Agincourt.
1429 A. D.	Joan of Arc rallies the French against the English.
1450 A. D. (about)	Invention of printing.
1452-1519 A. D.	Leonardo da Vinci, the painter and scientist.
1453 A. D.	Turks capture Constantinople.
1455-85 A. D.	Wars of the Roses in England.
1473-1543 A. D.	Copernicus the astronomer.
1479 A. D.	Ferdinand and Isabella unify Spain.
1485-1603 A. D.	Tudor dynasty in England.
1487 A. D.	Diaz reaches the Cape of Good Hope.
1492 A. D.	Conquest of the Moors of Granada.
1492 A. D.	Discovery of islands in the West Indies by Columbus.
1498 A. D.	Discovery of the mainland of America by Columbus.
1498 A. D.	Vasco da Gama reaches Calicut in South India.
1512-29 A. D.	Cardinal Wolsey in power in England.
1513 A. D.	Balboa discovers the Pacific.
1517-55 A. D.	Period of the Reformation.
1517-31 A. D.	Luther leads the Reformation in Germany.
1519-20 A. D.	Cortez conquers Mexico.
1519-22 A. D.	Magellan's Voyage round the world.
1519-56 A. D.	Charles V Emperor.
1526 A. D.	Mogul conquest of India.
1529 A. D.	Turks attack Vienna.
1529-39 A. D.	Henry VIII carries through the reformation and spoliation of the Church in England.
1531 A. D.	Pizarro conquers Peru.
1532 A. D.	Machiavelli's <i>Prince</i> .

1534 A. D.	Henry VIII head of the English Church.
1536-64 A. D.	Calvin leads the Reformation in Geneva, and thence in France, Scotland, and Holland.
1540 A. D.	Foundation of the Jesuits.
1545-88 A. D.	Period of the Counter-Reformation.
1556-1605 A. D.	Akbar Emperor of India.
1558-1603 A. D.	Queen Elizabeth reigns in England.
1561-1626 A. D.	Francis Bacon the scientist.
1562-98 A. D.	Religious wars in France.
1564-1616 A. D.	Shakespeare.
1564-1626 A. D.	Galileo the astronomer.
1572-1609 A. D.	The revolt of the Netherlands from Spain.
1584 A. D.	Assassination of William the Silent.
1588 A. D.	The English defeat the Spanish Armada.
1600 A. D.	British East India Company formed.
1603-88 A. D.	Stuart dynasty in England.
1607 A. D.	Foundation of Virginia [first English settlement colony].
1611 A. D.	First English trading factory in India.
1618-48 A. D.	Thirty Years' War in Germany.
1620 A. D.	Foundation of New England settlement colonies.
1628 A. D.	Harvey discovers the circulation of the blood.
1629-50 A. D.	Taj Mahal built.
1638 A. D.	The Russians reach the Pacific across Siberia and found Okhotsk.
1642 A. D.	English Civil War, King against Parliament.
1642-1727 A. D.	Isaac Newton the mathematician.
1643-1715 A. D.	Louis XIV King of France.
1644 A. D.	Manchus conquer China.
1648 A. D.	Treaty of Westphalia.
1649-59 A. D.	Cromwell rules in England.
1683 A. D.	The Turks attack Vienna.
1689 A. D.	English Parliament gives the throne to William III.
1696-1725 A. D.	Peter the Great Emperor of Russia.
1701-13 A. D.	War of the Spanish Succession.
1704 A. D.	England obtains Gibraltar.
1713 A. D.	Treaty of Utrecht.
1715-74 A. D.	Louis XV King of France.
1740-8 A. D.	War of the Austrian Succession.
1740-86 A. D.	Frederick II (the Great) King of Prussia.
1750-1850 A. D.	Period of the Industrial Revolution.
1752 A. D.	Diderot's Encyclopaedia.
1756-63 A. D.	Seven Years' War.
1759 A. D.	Wolfe takes Quebec.
1763 A. D.	Treaty of Paris; Canada ceded to Britain.
1764-79 A. D.	Cook's voyages of discovery.
1765 A. D.	Joseph II in power in Austria.
1775-83 A. D.	American War of Independence.
1783 A. D.	Treaty of Versailles between Britain and the United States of America.
1787 A. D.	Promulgation of American Constitution.
1788 A. D.	First settlement in Australia.
1789 A. D.	French Revolution begins.

1789-97 A. D.	Washington President of the United States.
1792-1815 A. D.	Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars.
1796 A. D.	Jenner begins to practise vaccination.
1796-1815 A. D.	Napoleon in power in France.
1807 A. D.	Abolition of the slave-trade by British Parliament.
1814 A. D.	First settlement in New Zealand.
1814 A. D.	First locomotive engine built by George Stephenson.
1815 A. D.	Congress of Vienna.
1815 A. D.	Holy Alliance.
1829-37 A. D.	Jackson President of the United States.
1832 A. D.	English Reform Bill.
1833 A. D.	Slavery abolished in British Empire.
1840 A. D.	New Zealand part of the British Empire.
1846 A. D.	Anaesthetics first used in operations.
1848 A. D.	'The Year of Revolutions.'
1849 A. D.	Roman Republic under Mazzini.
1849-73 A. D.	Livingstone's travels in Africa.
1852-95 A. D.	Pasteur's discoveries regarding bacteria.
1854-6 A. D.	Crimean War.
1858 A. D.	English Crown assumes Government of India.
1859 A. D.	Darwin's <i>Origin of Species</i> .
1859 A. D.	North Italy liberated.
1860 A. D.	Ganibaldi frees Southern Italy.
1860 A. D.	Lincoln elected President of the United States.
1861-5 A. D.	American Civil War.
1863 A. D.	Abolition of slavery in the United States.
1865 A. D.	Assassination of Lincoln.
1866 A. D.	War between Austria and Prussia.
1867 A. D.	Dominion of Canada established.
1867 A. D.	Hungary placed on an equality with Austria.
1870 A. D.	Italy is united, with Rome as capital.
1870-1 A. D.	Franco-Prussian War.
1871 A. D.	German Empire established.
1877-8 A. D.	Russo-Turkish War.
1878 A. D.	Congress of Berlin.
1899 and 1907 A. D.	Peace Conferences at The Hague.
1900 A. D.	Commonwealth of Australia established.
1901-9 A. D.	Roosevelt President of the United States.
1906 A. D.	Self-government granted to the Transvaal.
1909 A. D.	Peary reaches the North Pole.
1909 A. D.	First aeroplane flight across the English Channel.
1910 A. D.	Union of South Africa established.
1911 A. D.	Amundsen reaches the South Pole.
1912 A. D.	Chinese Republic established.
1912 A. D.	Scott reaches the South Pole.
1914-18 A. D.	Great European War.
1917 A. D.	Russian Revolution: the Bolsheviks gain power.
1918 A. D.	Franchise given to women in Great Britain.
1918 A. D.	Revolutions in Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, &c.
1919 A. D.	Peace Conference at Paris.
1919 A. D.	Foundation of the League of Nations.
1919 A. D.	Indian Reform Scheme.
1921 A. D.	Self-government granted to Ireland.